

CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

MONDAY, April 13, 1998

New York Times

April 13, 1998

Pg. 1

Aerospace Firms' Ties With China Raise Questions

By Jeff Gerth

WASHINGTON -- In the 1992 election, many of the United States' aerospace manufacturers backed Bill Clinton. But when Clinton took office, he immediately disappointed some of them on a key issue, barring them from launching their most lucrative satellites on China's low-cost rockets.

The aerospace companies' counterattack was vehement -- and eventually effective. After a lobbying campaign that included personal appeals to the president by Michael Armstrong, the chief executive of Hughes Electronics, Clinton gradually came to take the industry's side.

But there was an important caveat: The companies had to keep a tight rein on sophisticated technology sought by the Chinese military.

So in May 1997 the administration was jolted by a highly classified Pentagon report concluding that scientists from Hughes and Loral Space and Communications had turned over expertise that significantly improved the reliability of China's nuclear mis-

siles, officials said.

The report, whose existence has been secret, prompted a criminal investigation of the companies, which officials said was undermined this year when Clinton approved Loral's export to China of the same information about guidance systems. Loral's chairman was the largest personal donor to the Democratic Party last year.

An examination of the administration's handling of the space case, based on interviews with administration officials and industry executives, illustrates the competing forces that buffet Clinton on China policy.

In this instance, the president's desire to limit the spread of missile technology was balanced against the commercial interests of powerful U.S. businesses, many of which were White House allies and substantial supporters of the Democratic Party.

"From the Chinese point of view, this was the key case study on how the administration would operate on contentious issues," an administration expert on China said. The mes-

sage, the official added, was that administration policy on issues like the spread of weapons and human-rights abuses "could be reversed by corporations."

The White House denied any political interference in the issue.

"I am certainly not aware that our policy has been influenced by domestic political considerations," said Gary Samore, the senior director for nonproliferation and export controls at the National Security Council. "From where I sit, this has been handled as a national security issue: seeking to use China's interest in civilian space cooperation as leverage to obtain nonproliferation goals."

The administration's China policy has come under intense scrutiny in the last year. Congressional investigators have been examining whether China sought to influence policy through illegal campaign contributions to Democratic candidates in 1996. That connection, first suggested in intelligence reports, was never proved.

The handling of the satellite

case raises questions about the influence of American contributors on China policy, according to officials.

Since 1991, the aerospace industry has divided its political contributions equally between Democrats and Republicans. In the same period, however, Loral and Hughes tilted toward the Democratic Party, giving \$2.5 million to Democratic candidates and causes and \$1 million to the Republicans.

Administration officials say the contributions played no role in the decisions to permit China to launch U.S. satellites.

"The government has to balance risks: the risk in not letting American companies get their satellites launched by the Chinese, which would reduce our high-tech advantages, and the inherent risks of technology transfer," said James Rubin, the State Department spokesman. "That's why we impose such strict safeguards, and we are determined to investigate and use our laws to prevent that

Pol Pot's Fate Grows More Uncertain

New York Times...See Pg. 3

Army bent regulations in general's retirement

Exit was honorable despite sex probe

Washington Times...See Pg. 4

Backlash in The Ranks

A disturbing report on 'don't ask, don't tell'

Newsweek...See Pg. 5



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



possibility."

Waivers Required After Tiananmen

The criminal investigation of Hughes and Loral has its roots in 1989, when sanctions were imposed after the massacre of pro-democracy demonstrators at Tiananmen Square, requiring a presidential waiver for satellite launchings. Eleven such waivers have been granted by Clinton and his predecessor, George Bush.

But in late 1992, U.S. intelligence discovered that Chinese companies had sold missile technology to Pakistan, raising tensions in the subcontinent.

In the first months of Clinton's presidency, Democrats and Republicans in Congress pressed the administration to take action. Clinton responded with sanctions that barred U.S. companies from sending military goods to any of the Chinese concerns involved in the Pakistan deal.

The move had the effect of halting several pending and future U.S. satellite deals because the Chinese rocket-launching company was one of the companies under sanctions.

Armstrong of Hughes, a subsidiary of General Motors Corp., wasted no time in getting the president's attention. He wrote two blunt letters in September and October 1993 that reminded Clinton of his support for several presidential policy initiatives like the North American Free Trade Agreement, officials said.

He bemoaned his company's loss of business to foreign competitors and requested Clinton's personal involvement. Hughes' biggest loss, the company says, was the opportunity for a joint satellite manufacturing plant in China, which the Chinese awarded to a European competitor.

Were Satellites Civilian or Military?

A key issue was whether

Hughes satellites were civilian or military, a murky question in the export control laws. If the satellites were labeled commercial, the sanctions invoked over the Pakistan deal did not apply. Armstrong told Clinton, officials said, that Hughes satellites should not be considered military, because their technology did not have military applications.

Soon after the letters, Clinton assured Armstrong in an open meeting that he was trying to resolve the tussle between the State Department, which licensed military exports and wanted to keep authority over satellites, and the Commerce Department, which licensed all other exports and was on the side of the satellite industry.

"I'm trying to get on top of this to decide what to do," Clinton told Armstrong.

At about the same time, the administration gave signals that it was moving toward the industry's position. After one signal, Armstrong sent a letter to a senior White House official relaying a positive reaction from Chinese officials, White House officials said.

In early January 1994, the president sent another positive signal -- what Hughes officials then called a "a good first step." Three satellites were labeled as civilian, including one slightly modified Hughes satellite, which allowed their launchings to proceed.

Clinton's decision helped the industry. But the satellite makers wanted a broader decision that made the Commerce Department the primary licensing authority for virtually all satellites. The Commerce Department weighs the economic consequences when it considers an export license. By contrast, the State Department looks at security concerns.

Loral Trip to China With Ron Brown

In 1994, Loral's chairman

and chief executive, Bernard Schwartz, went to China with Commerce Secretary Ron Brown. Brown helped Loral close a mobile telephone satellite network deal in Beijing.

A few weeks later, the president's top political aide, Harold Ickes, wrote Clinton a memo in which he said Schwartz "is prepared to do anything he can for the administration."

In December 1994 the president selected Armstrong to head his Export Council.

And the sanctions stemming from the Pakistan sale were lifted in late 1994 as China promised to curb missile sales to other countries.

Still, the satellite industry had not achieved a major objective. So in 1995 Armstrong sent another letter to Clinton, signed by Schwartz, arguing that the Commerce Department should become the primary licensing authority for satellite exports, an industry executive said.

(Armstrong, who recently became the chief executive of AT&T, declined through a spokeswoman to comment.)

The debate not only affected national security but also had enormous commercial implications. The businesses that rely on satellites are highly competitive, and European companies were more than willing to take advantage of China's low-cost services. Without the Chinese, U.S. companies faced long waits to get their satellites sent into orbit because of a shortage of rockets.

Satellite technology is crucial to an increasing number of businesses, from cellular telephone networks to global broadcast conglomerates.

Finally in March 1996 Clinton shifted major licensing responsibilities for almost all satellites to the Commerce Department. The State Department retained control over a few highly sophisticated satel-

lites as well as any sensitive support activities, or technical assistance, in connection with civilian satellites.

The industry and the Chinese applauded the action. But the events that followed a failed launching in China immediately raised questions about whether the new policy sent a wrong signal.

Chinese Rocket for Loral Crashes

On Feb. 15, 1996, a Chinese rocket carrying a \$200 million Loral satellite crashed 22 seconds after lift-off at the Xichang Satellite Launching Center in southern China.

Chinese officials needed to figure out what went wrong. By April an outside review commission, headed by Loral, was assembled to help the Chinese study the accident. It included two scientists from Hughes.

On May 10 the commission completed a preliminary report, based on more than "200 pages of data, analysis evaluation and reports," documents show. It found that the cause of the accident was an electrical flaw in the electronic flight-control system.

But the report, which was promptly shared with the Chinese, discussed other sensitive aspects of the rocket's guidance and control systems, an area of weakness in China's missile programs, according to government and industry officials.

The State Department learned about the report and made contact with Loral.

Loral, in what officials said was a cooperative effort, provided the review commission's report and a long letter explaining what happened. Loral told other commission members, including the two Hughes scientists, to retrieve all copies of the report because of the serious security concerns of the government, officials said.

But the two Hughes em-

NOTICE TO READERS

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

ployees believed that there was no legal obligation to comply with the request, officials also said. In late May, Hughes received a letter from the State Department charging that the transfer of information was a violation of the arms export control laws, according to officials. Loral received no such letter.

One year later the Pentagon completed its damage assessment of the incident. It concluded, officials said, that "United States national security has been harmed."

The Pentagon report prompted a criminal investigation into Loral and Hughes by the Justice Department and the Customs Service. The companies say their employees have acted properly, but they decline

to discuss the matter.

Was License Needed From State Department?

One key issue is whether the data turned over to the Chinese required a State Department license and, if so, whether company officials were aware of that fact.

The criminal inquiry has found evidence that several days before the review committee had its first meeting with Chinese officials, Loral executives were told by its security advisers that any sharing of information required a State Department license, according to administration officials. Loral never sought a license, but it may have sounded out the State Department.

An industry official said

Loral had immediately told the State Department about the review commission meeting with the Chinese but had received no reply.

Whatever the evidence, criminal charges may never be brought, because Clinton approved the export to China by Loral of similar satellite guidance information two months ago. He acted despite the strong opposition of the Justice Department, whose officials argued that the approval would seriously undercut any criminal case.

The required notice to Congress by the president of his action was sent during a recess.

Administration officials say the decision was politically sensitive but correct because no wrongdoing had been proved

and Loral had subsequently acted responsibly.

Since the inquiry began, Beijing and Washington have been exploring even more space cooperation. Last fall President Jiang Zemin visited the United States and stopped at a Hughes site to talk about satellites. In advance of Clinton's trip to China in June, the administration is seeking a broader agreement with Beijing on space cooperation.

But the chairman of the House International Relations Committee, Benjamin Gilman, R-N.Y., says the administration should provide a "thorough review" of the Hughes-Loral case to Congress before it goes ahead with a plan to expedite approvals for U.S. satellite launchings by China.

New York Times April 13, 1998 Pg. 1

Analysis

Pol Pot's Fate Grows More Uncertain

By Seth Mydans

SIEM REAP, Cambodia -- Year Zero began 23 years ago this week when the communist Khmer Rouge guerrillas marched into Phnom Penh in their black shirts and rubber sandals and launched one of the world's most terrifying attempts at utopia.

Restarting history's clock, they emptied Cambodia's cities and turned the country into a vast labor camp. Over the next four years, more than 1 million people were executed or died of hunger, disease or exhaustion.

Today the mastermind of the killing fields, Pol Pot, 73, is reportedly ailing and besieged in a jungle hideout in northern Cambodia, the sound of gunfire around him, closer to capture than he has ever been.

Over the last two weeks, Cambodian government troops and Khmer Rouge defectors have been on the attack, and the United States has revived contingency plans for his arrest and possible trial abroad.

It appears that the end game is under way for the bizarre and brutal movement that sought to reduce Cambodia to a primitive agrarian society, and then held out for nearly two decades after being driven into the jungles by

a Vietnamese invasion in 1979.

But although the end could come quickly, it could instead take months to arrive. The last hard-line Khmer Rouge holdouts, their numbers shrunk by defections, have withdrawn to a steep mountain stronghold surrounded by a heavily mined forest.

"It is excellent territory for a guerrilla war," said a Cambodian expert on the Khmer Rouge. He noted that a few hundred royalist soldiers, driven from the capital by a coup last summer, have kept government soldiers at bay for 10 months in their own jungle stronghold.

When the end finally comes, one possibility is the death of Pol Pot at the hands of his comrades or captors well before he could be brought to trial. For those who may control his fate, diplomats and Cambodian analysts say, he is most dangerous alive and testifying about their involvement with him.

Pol Pot has few friends left and virtually no options for refuge. He was condemned by his own lieutenants to house arrest in a show trial last July, and now appears to be living at the sufferance of men who learned from him the cheapness of human life.

Even if Pol Pot is captured alive, difficult political and legal hurdles remain before any trial could convene. At the moment, there is no legal framework for an international tribunal to try him and no clear authority under which he could be seized or held by foreign nations.

His own country, still traumatized by his brutal rule, is too fragile and too frightened by its past to be able to consider putting him on trial itself.

The capital, Phnom Penh, 200 miles southeast of here, is now consumed by the beginning of an election campaign that is defined by mortal feuds whose roots date to the Pol Pot years and the decade-long civil war that followed.

The collapse of the Khmer Rouge movement began nearly two years ago when big chunks of its army in western Cambodia defected to the government, retaining their territory and command structure.

The split entered the inner circle last June when Pol Pot ordered the killing of a top lieutenant, Son Sen, causing a backlash in which his comrades apparently turned on him and took him prisoner.

In Phnom Penh, Norodom Ranariddh, one of Cambodia's two co-prime ministers, said that he was in contact with Pol Pot's captors and that the Khmer Rouge founder would soon be turned over for trial.

It was at this time that the United States began vigorously

lobbying for the creation of an international tribunal that could put him on trial for crimes against humanity.

These preparations faced difficult questions about the authority of a foreign country to seize Pol Pot and about the willingness and legal standing of any nation to receive him pending trial. In the U.N. Security Council, a vote to create a special tribunal met opposition from China, which until a few years ago was the patron of the Khmer Rouge.

Hopes for the arrest of Pol Pot ended when Ranariddh's rival co-prime minister, Hun Sen -- himself a former Khmer Rouge commander -- ousted him in early July.

But the heart had gone out of the Khmer Rouge movement. The fighters and their peasant families, who lived harsh lives in guerrilla territory, were learning about the schooling, health care and free enterprise that the defectors were enjoying.

Two weeks ago, in a move that diplomats said had been coordinated with government forces, several thousand guerrillas in Anlong Veng mutinied and seized the central village in the sprawling jungle territory controlled by the Khmer Rouge.

The core leadership, led by a longtime Khmer Rouge commander named Ta Mok, retreated to its mountain stronghold. Ta Mok's men reportedly retook the village.

Critic of Mexican Army Gets New Sentence

MEXICO CITY—A court-martialed Mexican general described by human rights activists as a prisoner of conscience has been sentenced to a second 14-year prison term by a military court, Mexican media reported.

Gen. Francisco Gallardo, 50, was arrested on charges of illegal enrichment and other offenses in March 1993, a month after he published an article criticizing the army's human rights record and called for an independent agency to monitor abuses.

The crimes he was charged with were allegedly committed five years earlier.

only to lose it again last week.

This last holdout group, estimated variously to include from 200 to 1,500 guerrillas, now has its back to the border of Thailand. For decades, this border has been the refuge and supply line for the Khmer Rouge, who have crossed it often.

Over the years, a strong

network of commercial and personal ties has grown up between people on both sides of the border, and the Khmer Rouge have powerful defenders inside Thailand.

But with the end game now under way, and the glare of public attention on them, there may soon be no refuge available.

Army bent regulations in general's retirement

Exit was honorable despite sex probe

By Rowan Scarborough
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The Army didn't follow its own regulation in allowing Maj. Gen. David R. Hale to retire honorably at the same time the Pentagon was investigating a woman's accusation that he forced her into a sexual relationship.

An Army regulation, "suspension of favorable personnel actions," dictates that a soldier's record be flagged if he is being investigated. The rule states that those flagged are prohibited from receiving any of 13 listed personnel benefits, one of which is retirement.

In the case of Gen. Hale, Gen. Dennis Reimer, the Army chief of staff, approved his abrupt retirement Feb. 23 at a time when the Pentagon's inspector general was investigating the major general.

An Army personnel expert, who asked not to be named, said he interpreted the flagging regulation (Army Regulation 600-8-2) as prohibiting Gen. Reimer from letting Gen. Hale retire until the probe was done or a written waiver was issued. The Army was aware of the probe at the time he retired.

In response to questions from The Washington Times, the Army issued a brief statement Friday saying that general officers, unlike

other soldiers, are processed through a separate General Officer Management Office. The office is under Gen. Reimer's direction.

"In the specific case of Maj. Gen. Hale," the Army said, "the retirement was approved based upon the information available on that day, which indicated no reason to deny or delay his request. . . ."

The Army declined to elaborate on the statement.

The Times reported March 27 that Donnamaria Carpino has told IG agents that Gen. Hale forced her into a sexual relationship in 1997 while she was married to an Army colonel under the general's command in Turkey. She said he promised to protect her husband from adultery charges if she agreed to a "physical commitment." Her now ex-husband suspects the adultery accusations were fabricated.

Gen. Hale's military attorney has declined to respond to her charges. Gen. Hale left his post as Army deputy inspector general after four months in a job where officials normally serve one to two years.

The IG began the probe in January. Mrs. Carpino, who divorced her husband in November, met again with investigators this week. She has passed two lie detector tests, according to the examiner's written reports.

The case has raised the issue of whether the Army operates a double standard for generals and lower-ranking personnel accused of wrongdoing.

For example, critics note that the Army prosecuted Sgt. Maj. Gene C. McKinney on sexual misconduct charges while letting Gen. Hale retire honorably before his investigation ended. Sgt. Maj. McKinney's record was flagged, and he was not allowed to retire without first facing disciplinary action, according to his attorney, Charles Gittins, who also represents Mrs. Carpino.

Sgt. Maj. McKinney was acquitted at court-martial of all sexual misconduct counts but convicted

on one charge of obstructing justice.

After The Times published its story, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen ordered the Defense Department general counsel to investigate why Gen. Reimer granted Gen. Hale retirement.

"The office of the general counsel is reviewing the process in which the matter was handled and the adequacy of the channels of communications," said Col. Richard Bridges, a Pentagon spokesman.

The Army flagging regulation states the rule is intended to "guard against the accidental execution of specified favorable personnel actions for soldiers not in good standing."

The rule then goes on to say a flag "will be submitted when an unfavorable action or investigation (formal or informal) is started against a soldier by military or civilian authorities."

Mr. Gittins said Friday that the regulation "clearly prohibits retirement once an officer is under investigation, as was Gen. Hale."

He added: "Gen. Reimer is not above the laws and regulations governing the Army, yet he clearly violated them. His conduct in violation of the regulations was intentional and willful. He should be held accountable like any other soldier would be who violated a general regulation."

John S. Jenkins, associate dean of the George Washington University Law School, said all the services typically prohibit personnel under investigation from being discharged or retiring.

"In my experience that was standard practice," said Mr. Jenkins, who was the Navy's judge advocate general from 1980 to 1982. "If there was an allegation, you wanted to look into it to ensure you weren't releasing someone into retirement when there was a serious charge pending. . . . The most important reason is, we don't want to lose jurisdiction."

The Army has said it could re-

call Gen. Hale to active duty for punishment if the investigation merits. But the Army cannot cite on example of an officer summoned back for that purpose.

The Army also defends the retirement on the grounds the ongoing investigation had yet to produce a substantiated allegation. To trigger Army regulation 600-8-2, a proven allegation doesn't have to exist, only the existence of an investigation.

Iran moves subs into Strait of Hormuz

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

TEHRAN, Iran — Iran began naval exercises off its coast yesterday, promising to show off three new

Russian-built submarines.

The nine-day exercises, on both sides of the Strait of Hormuz, through which 20 percent of the world's oil passes, are aimed at strengthening the country's combat capabilities, Tehran reported.

The U.S. Navy usually stations 15 to 20 warships in the gulf to patrol its shipping lanes.

Backlash in The Ranks

A disturbing report on 'don't ask, don't tell'

BY GREGORY L. VISTICA AND EVAN THOMAS

IT WAS DEFINITELY NOT THE RESULT President Bill Clinton had in mind when he instituted the "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" policy toward gays in the military in 1993. Last week the Pentagon disclosed that the number of soldiers, sailors and airmen discharged for homosexuality had increased by 67 percent—from 597 in 1994 to 997 in 1997. The architects of the policy had hoped to foster a live-and-let-live attitude. But they may have underestimated the ingrained resistance against gays and lesbians—as well as the resentment uniformed soldiers feel toward civilian policymakers who seek to impose new values on the military culture.

The Pentagon tried to put a benign spin on the numbers. Defense Secretary William Cohen declared that most of the discharged gays had voluntarily opted out. But his spokesman, Kenneth Bacon, acknowledged that "we can only speculate as to why they are doing this." Edwin Dorn, a former un-

der secretary of Defense who helped imple-

ment the policy, suggested to NEWSWEEK that more gays were coming forward because a military discharge for homosexuality carries less of a stigma these days. Northwestern University professor Charles Moskos, an expert on military sociology and one of the designers of "don't ask, don't tell," noted that a disproportionate number declaring their homosexuality are young women serving their first tours of duty. The military can no longer ask new recruits if they are gay, and some enlistees, who are typically only 19 or 20 years old, apparently don't decide on their sexual orientation until they are already in uniform. In an interview with NEWSWEEK, Moskos said he thought some troops disliked the military and believed that declaring themselves homosexuals could be a quick way out.

A backlash in the ranks against "don't ask, don't tell" may also help explain the rising discharge rate. One recent survey of men in the Army shows that well over half would "feel uncomfortable" with gays in their unit and believe that "allowing openly gay soldiers in the Army would be very disruptive of discipline." Declarations of homosexuality can be extracted in subtle and not-so-subtle ways. In January, a federal judge ordered the Navy to reinstate Timothy R. McVeigh (no relation to the Oklahoma City bomber), a senior chief petty officer accused of soliciting homosexual lovers on the Internet. McVeigh, the "Chief of Boat" aboard the

nuclear submarine Chicago, used only his first name and made no mention of his military service while surfing in cyberspace, but investigators learned McVeigh's identity from his Internet provider, America Online.

Sailors sometimes resort to cruder plays to purge their ranks. Last fall Barry Waldrop, an enlisted man aboard the carrier Eisenhower, found YOU'RE A DEAD FAGGOT scrawled in Magic Marker on his bunk. The ship's officers refused to protect him until he declared his homosexuality—for which he was promptly discharged. Homosexuals have also been outed by their chaplains, therapists and even family members. According to a gay watchdog group, the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, a naval officer was discharged last year after seeking spiritual counseling because he felt a tension between his sexual orientation and his faith. It's doubtful that gays will find true acceptance in the military any time soon. Meanwhile, says Moskos, "don't ask, don't tell" remains "the worst system possible—except for any other."

Time

April 20, 1998

The Pentagon Gays Say Don't Rely on Don't Ask, Don't Tell

The Pentagon once again last week had to defend its "Don't ask, don't tell" policy. It was implemented in 1994, after a debate between the White House, which wanted to let gays serve openly, and Congress and the military, which did not.

The compromise ostensibly protected gays in uniform so

long as they didn't flaunt their sexual orientation. But the number of personnel kicked out of the service for being gay soared from 617 in 1994 to 997 last year. The Pentagon says that 80% of those removed in 1997 declared their homosexuality; they told. Gay-rights

groups instead pointed to witch hunts by overly zealous officers.

Defense Secretary William Cohen apparently thinks they have a point, and he is shortly expected to approve new guidelines to ensure that the policy is implemented fairly. Commanders will have to get

permission to investigate from military legal authorities. Also, inducements for implicating others in gay relationships will not be so easily offered, and soldiers who harass their fellows by calling them gay will be punished. --By Mark Thompson/Washington

Wall Street Journal

April 13, 1998

Pg. 1

Palestinian police arrested a leading Hamas member Saturday as relations between officials allied with Arafat and the Muslim militant group grew increasingly tense. Hamas is accusing Arafat's security chief of conspiring with Israel in the recent killing of the group's chief bomb engineer.

Russia's Communist leader threatened a Constitutional Court challenge to Yeltsin's renomination of Sergei Kiriyenko for premier. The Duma rejected his candidacy on Friday. The Russian president has said he will dissolve the legislature if it defies him.

So Far So Good as Chemical Weapons Are Burned in Utah, Officials Say

By James Brooke

TOOELE, Utah -- In the still air of this desert valley, home to the world's largest stockpile of chemical weapons, a collective sigh of relief is almost audible.

In nearly two years of operation, a prototype chemical weapons incinerator has destroyed 1,500 tons of sarin gas, one quarter of the depot's stock. Zeroing in on faulty lots of weapons, disposal workers also cut the number of "leakers" last year to 27, two-thirds the annual average number of bombs found to be leaking chemical gas here in the 1990s.

The results -- and the local revenue -- have prompted at least one local official to suggest transporting other chemical weapon stocks to here for destruction, although the idea is widely opposed.

Environmentalists had bitterly fought the Tooele incinerator, once predicting that workers would come out in "body bags." But the only recorded injuries have been to two workers who slipped on icy walkways outside the incinerator, 17 miles south of Tooele (pronounced too-ELL-ah), a booming bedroom community of about 15,000 people in north-central Utah.

"My constituents are pleased we are finally getting rid of this stuff," said the local official, Gary Griffith of the Tooele County Commission, which has long supported the incineration of the weapons here.

The massive incinerator is the world's most concrete advance in weapons reduction since the Chemical Weapons Convention went into effect one year ago. This treaty rules out the methods of disposal that were popular through the 1970s: open burning on windless days, burial by bulldozers and dumping in the ocean.

Tooele's incinerator, which resembles a steamship beached in the desert 45 miles southwest of Salt Lake City, is the fruit of 20 years and several billion federal dollars in re-

search and construction.

"This is the Rolls-Royce of incinerators," said Amy Smithson, who has reviewed the plant's operation and who is a senior associate at the Henry L. Stimson Center, a research organization in Washington that specializes in military issues. "The Army has put more safeguards on this incinerator than exist on any incinerator in the world."

Russian technicians have toured the Tooele incinerator as part of efforts to destroy all of their country's stocks. But Russia, whose 40,000 tons of chemical weapons is the world's largest stockpile, is not expected to meet the treaty's 2007 deadline, because its government lacks sufficient money.

In the 1980s, the U.S. military withdrew all its chemical weapons stocks from Europe and shipped them to Johnston Atoll, in the Pacific. An incinerator started operating there in 1993 and has burned about 1,500 tons, or almost 75 percent of the stocks.

Two more chemical weapons incinerators are under construction at storage sites in the United States: one at Anniston, Ala., the other at Hermiston, Ore. A construction contract is to be awarded soon for an incinerator at Pine Bluff, Ark. And government researchers are testing chemical neutralization technologies for possible use at the other stockpile bases: Aberdeen, Md; Richmond, Ky; Newport, Ind., and Pueblo, Colo.

But environmentalists continue to try to block all incinerators, including Tooele's, saying they are unsafe.

"Our lawsuits are meant to derail the technology, not the U.S. mission," said Craig Williams of the Chemical Weapons Working Group, a citizens' coalition based in Kentucky. "These facilities, as they are designed and operating, do not protect the public."

Utah has reason to be skeptical about the military's safety claims. In Nevada in the 1950s, the military exploded nuclear

bombs in open-air tests when the wind was blowing away from Las Vegas and toward Utah. In 1968, about 6,400 sheep were accidentally killed when the wind changed during an open air test of a nerve agent at the Dugway Proving Grounds, an Army installation about 40 miles west of here.

But a series of scientific reviews seem to be easing public fears about Tooele's incinerator, the first to operate in the continental United States. In two telephone surveys conducted last year by Dan Jones and Associates, a polling group, the number of respondents in the Salt Lake area who considered the incinerator risk to be "significant" or "very significant" dropped sharply, to 28 percent in September, from 44 percent the previous March.

Last year, a panel of 16 independent scientists reviewed operations at the Tooele plant at the request of the National Research Council. In its report, the panel upheld Army calculations that said burning Tooele's munitions would be far less dangerous than storing them.

Then in September, a separate study rated "prospects for continued safe operation" of the incinerator as "very good." This report was prepared by independent consultants contracted by the Utah Citizens Advisory Commission, a diverse group appointed by the governor, Michael Leavitt, a Republican.

The report was commissioned after a series of plant shutdowns and accusations of lax safety practices by former managers at the Tooele Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, as the plant is officially known.

"While there have been highly publicized problems and occurrences at T.O.C.D.F.," the report said, "these have been very minor with respect to both public and worker safety. None of these have resulted in release of measurable amounts of agent into the atmosphere and no appreciable agent exposures have occurred to workers,

visitors, or the public."

In a highly computerized plant dependent on robots, shutdowns are to be expected at the outset, the report said. But the report added, "The operating staff are gaining experience and operations are becoming more routine."

Oversight is so heavy, the report said, that some managers spend up to 50 percent of their time responding to inspections and audits. In a 10-month period, there were 28 outside evaluations of the incinerator. Such favorable safety reports have prompted The Salt Lake Tribune, Utah's largest newspaper, to publish a series of editorials with such headlines as "Burn chemical weapons" and "Incinerating the doubts."

Next June, a permit to double the plant's rate for incineration is expected to be issued by Utah's governing agency, the Solid and Hazardous Waste Control Board.

"If we can go full rate at midyear, we can really take off in terms of quantities of agents disposed," said Timothy Thomas, manager of the incineration program here.

So far, the incinerator has destroyed almost 14,000 rockets, bombs and bulk containers in the process of burning the sarin gas. With the perception of a smooth operation, some people here have been emboldened to challenge inhibitions on transporting chemical weapons.

Government plans to duplicate Tooele's \$650 million disposal plant at the seven other sites around the nation represent a colossal waste of taxpayers' money, argues Griffith, the county commissioner.

"None of this stuff was hatched here to begin with," he said of the chemical weapons that were shipped here by rail and road, largely from a Denver production plant, in the 1950s and 1960s.

Arguing that stocks in Colorado, Arkansas and Oregon should be shipped to Tooele for incineration, Griffith said duplication meant that "we are spending billions for nothing."

"We let mass hysteria, lack of common sense, steal money out of our pockets," he added.

But on a broader state and national level, his idea does not have much support. And lo-

cally, some environmentalists say they suspect, county officials are falling in love with their plant for economic reasons. Under the conditions for incineration, the county receives \$970 from the Army for every ton of chemical agent incinerated. These royalties, about \$1.5 million so far, are helping to finance the construction of sports complex on the edge of town.

Before the incineration began at the Tooele incinerator on Aug. 22, 1996, the Desert Chemical Depot, as the Army installation is officially known, held 13,600 tons of chemical weapons, or 43 percent of the nation's total arsenal of 31,500 tons.

On the issue of transporting weapon stocks for destruction, advocates of local disposal contend that the days of shut-

ting chemical weapons around the nation are over. Public opinion and the unstable nature of 50-year-old chemical weapons rule out transportation, they say.

"The politics of transportation are impossible," said Ross Vincent, a member of a parallel panel of advisers in Colorado, the Chemical Demilitarization Citizens Advisory Commission. "Here in Pueblo, we

would be lucky to get this stuff across the county line, much less across the state line."

Vincent, a Sierra Club official, also argued that transportation to Utah could prove as expensive as destruction in Colorado.

"You would have to build new fleets to move this stuff," he said. "You would have to buy off every county between here and the destination site."

San Diego Union-Tribune April 12, 1998 Pg. B1

Shipment of napalm finally gets under way

Canisters bound for Indiana over protests

By Susan Gembrowski
STAFF WRITER

FALLBROOK -- The first rail shipment of Vietnam War-era napalm left Fallbrook yesterday, after years of failed removal projects and weeks of political wrangling that had delayed the latest \$24 million disposal plan.

Two 6,000-gallon isotank containers were driven from the napalm separation plant at the Fallbrook Naval Weapons Facility and across the adjoining Camp Pendleton Marine base.

The tankers were loaded onto one flatbed train car, and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe train pulled out at about 12:40 p.m. bound for Pollution Control Industries in East Chicago, Ind.

"This is the beginning of the final phase of this project, which has had safety as a priority and is the most responsible method of recycling the canisters," said Lt. Cmdr. Jon Smith, spokesman at the Naval Facilities Engineering Headquarters in Alexandria, Va.

The Navy plans to take two years to transport the 23 million pounds of napalm stored at its facility in Fallbrook.

Rail routes are expected to vary, but the napalm likely will move through Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas and Missouri to Burlington Northern Santa Fe tracks, and then be shifted at Galesburg, Ill., to the tracks of the Elgin, Joliet & Eastern.

The napalm shipments could take up to two weeks to reach the Indiana disposal plant. The Midwest company

will keep it no longer than 24 hours before shipping it to cement-making kilns in six Midwestern states, according to President Robert Campbell.

Yesterday's shipment ends a month of false starts for the Navy, which since the beginning of March has been poised to begin sending the napalm to the Indiana disposal plant.

The latest delay occurred after the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency issued a warning March 16 when the agency discovered that PCI had accepted unrelated hazardous waste in violation of federal Superfund laws. Campbell said the EPA was notified of the problem in October, but energy officials said an "internal mix-up" delayed the warning letter.

The napalm shipments were not officially halted by the EPA warning, but the Navy did initiate another delay, citing safety concerns.

"We never confirmed a timetable, but have said that as soon as the final details were worked out, we would be ready to go," Smith said.

During the delay, San Diego-area Reps. Ron Packard, R-Carlsbad, and Randy "Duke" Cunningham, R-Escondido, put pressure on various agencies and the White House to begin the shipments as soon as possible. They said the environmental agency sent the warning letter because of political pressure from the Illinois congressional delegation.

"I am pleased the Navy saw through the political grandstanding of opponents of the safe removal and recycling of the napalm," Packard said through a spokesman yester-

day. "There has been a lot of misinformation fed to the media about the integrity and safety of the process, and the Navy should be applauded for rising above it all."

Protests have come from both of Illinois' senators, Democrats Dick Durbin and Carol Moseley-Braun, and numerous Illinois House members, who do not want the napalm shipments going through their state.

Yesterday, it was very clear that those protests are not about to end.

The shipment that moved yesterday had been set to go last Wednesday, but the White House asked for a delay while President Clinton was visiting Chicago last week, a congressional source said yesterday. The napalm was expected to go out the next day, Thursday, but that didn't happen either, the source said.

On Friday, the EPA confirmed it was investigating potential new problems at the Midwest plant that could halt the shipments once again.

"We certainly haven't exhausted all of the avenues to fight the napalm shipments," Maggie Lockwood, spokeswoman for Illinois Republican

Rep. Jerry Weller, said yesterday. "It doesn't mean we can't stop the second, third or fourth shipment."

Opponents have raised safety issues at the PCI facility as well as potential dangers in the shipment and disposal of the napalm in their campaign to derail the project.

The March 16 EPA warning to the company came after a nine-day inspection at the plant discovered the firm had PCBs, or polychlorinated biphenyls, stored at the site. The EPA banned that type of waste in 1979 for health reasons.

The agency gave the company 60 days to remove the illegal hazardous waste or face losing its napalm disposal contract. Campbell said the company is removing the waste and will meet the time limit.

Cunningham and Packard also have accused the Department of Energy, which held the Navy disposal contract, and the White House Council on Environmental Control, which was looking at the PCB issue, of blocking the plan.

The Energy Department last week relinquished its oversight of the contract to the Navy, and a White House council spokesman said the agency was concerned about the illegally stored hazardous waste, not about stopping the napalm shipments.

New York Times April 13, 1998

Colombia's Samper Denies Army Losing War

By Reuters

BOGOTA - President Ernesto Samper rejected as "a fable" Sunday U.S. claims that Colombia's army was losing its war with Marxist rebels.

Seeking to end growing speculation about the possibility of a wider U.S. military role in Colombia, Samper also said the country would not accept foreign military intervention.

"The Colombian Armed Forces have control over all of

the national territory," Samper said in a speech in Mompox, a colonial city in northern Bolivar province.

"It is for this reason that reports over the past few days about the unstoppable advance of insurgent groups are nothing more than a fable, based on questionable intelligence reports," he added.

Samper was referring to a Washington Post story Friday that quoted a U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency report as saying that rebels, who have de facto political and military control over about 40 percent

of Colombia, could defeat the Colombian army within the next five years.

He was also referring to recent comments by Gen. Charles Wilhelm, head of the Miami-based U.S. Southern Command, who has said Colombia's army is incapable of winning its war with the rebels.

Wilhelm, who has called for stepped up U.S. military aid for Colombia, has also warned that its chronic instability threatens the entire region.

Colombian military commander Gen. Manuel Jose Bonett conceded in a news con-

ference last week that his 40,000-strong combat force was increasingly outgunned by an estimated 20,000 guerrillas. And he stressed that he would gladly accept any foreign aid offered him to defeat the guerrillas.

But Samper, who steps down in August, said no aid was wanted to fight the rebels.

"We are not soliciting, we are not seeking, nor will we accept foreign military aid to fight the armed insurgency," he said. "We want international backing to make peace, not to deepen the war."

The Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the country's largest and oldest rebel group, has dealt the army a number of blistering defeats over the last two years, highlighting what many analysts see as a perilous change in the strategic military balance.

In fighting Sunday in Meta province, in the same area just east of Bogota where the FARC has been holding three Americans and an Italian hostage since an attack on a major highway on March 23, at least two army officers and six other soldiers were killed.

Washington Times

April 13, 1998

Pg. 11

NATO turns up psy-ops heat to melt Bosnia war's chill

By Philip Smucker
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

VISEGRAD, Bosnia-Herzegovina — If there was ever a hard sell for the idealistic young soldiers who run NATO's revamped "psychological operations" — or psy-ops — program in Bosnia, it is the hardened psyche of the Bosnian Serbs.

Hardened by war and pummeled with nationalist propaganda, the Bosnian Serbs have considered themselves enemies of the free world since the U.S.-led, NATO bombing campaign in 1995.

Nevertheless, the U.S. and European officers in charge of the multimillion-dollar campaign to motivate selected populations and influence attitudes say their message seems to be sinking in.

"There has been a real thaw," said British Maj. Duncan Bullivant, who works in the office of Bosnia's top peace mediator, Spaniard Carlos Westendorp. "We are seeing the collective psychosis disappearing."

Military experts in the NATO's Brussels nerve center say high-tech, mass-communications blitzkriegs are at least as important in Bosnia as traditional warfare intelligence.

From high-tech airwave jamming equipment to glossy magazines, the forces are armed with the best communications tools available. They host talk shows on American-style rock stations and have air-dropped leaflets quoting Cicero and Thomas Jefferson.

The results are evident in a recent U.S. Information Service poll that shows 49 percent of the Bosnian Serbs believe progress to-

ward a lasting peace has been made in the past year.

Western diplomats also note that the International War Crimes Tribunal in The Hague is finally being taken seriously. In recent weeks indicted war crimes suspects have begun to walk into NATO outposts and surrender without a struggle.

That progress has come in spite of virulent anti-NATO propaganda from the hard-liners in the Bosnian Serb headquarters at Pale. Their tactics include setting off air raid sirens when NATO forces approach small towns and juxtaposing pictures of German Nazi troops with NATO soldiers on evening news shows.

"Much of our task is simply countering charges that we are an occupation force," said U.S. Lt. Col. Gene Thompson, who is directing several psy-ops programs. "We have no secret agents and we don't disseminate propaganda."

On a recent day in nearby Foca, home to eight indicted war crime suspects, German Lt. Gotz Kubitschek handed out leaflets encouraging residents to help persuade the suspects to surrender peacefully.

The handbill said international aid for the beleaguered residents depends on their honoring the U.S.-brokered Dayton accords, which require indicted persons to be sent to The Hague to stand trial.

Foca was the scene of mass murder and rape during the war, and many of the suspects there scorn the West.

"Of course there were war crimes, but if you consider everyone involved, you can say that we were defenders of our hometown," said one indicted suspect who asked to remain anonymous.

A few days later, Lt. Kubitschek

was in nearby Trnovo, handing out copies of NATO's magazine for young people, Mirko.

The magazine had a James Bond poster inside and stories about Bruce Willis and Cameron Diaz's latest film, "Life Less Ordinary." There was no mention of war crimes in the snappy Hollywood gossip columns.

Mirko's editor, Capt. Enno Urbeinz, said the exclusion was not an oversight. "We are launching long-term peace efforts, and our units are not the ones carrying out these operations [to arrest war criminals]," he said.

Nevertheless, questions have been raised within NATO about specific U.S. operations.

When mobs attacked U.S. troops in the city of Brcko late last year, Gen. David L. Grange decided to fight back from the sky. His forces air-dropped thousands of leaflets quoting Cicero, Jefferson, Kant and Voltaire and telling the Serbs they were being cheated by leaders such as their wartime president, Radovan Karadzic.

One British critic of that campaign asked whether the air drop didn't send a message that U.S. troops were afraid to take their message to the people by hand.

"I found the air drops unsettled and crude," said the diplomat, who asked not to be identified. "The Americans sometimes treat Bosnia like an East African republic, and I think they've hurt their own image that way."

Even the U.S. officers seem concerned that the air drop might have done more harm than good — at least in one respect. "Leaflets dropped from the sky tend to have a negative environmental impact," said Lt. Col. Thompson.

U.S. Predicts Eventual Arrest of Karadzic, Other Bosnia Suspects

Balkans: Pentagon's policy of restraint in apprehending accused war criminals is now praised.

By Norman Kempster
Times Staff Writer

WASHINGTON--Proclaiming victory for the Pentagon's once-scorned approach to accused war criminals in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Clinton administration officials said Friday that the eventual arrest of all suspects, including Radovan Karadzic, now seems certain.

Even officials at the State Department who had urged the Pentagon to move much more quickly against all accused war criminals now concede that the military's approach has been proven correct.

Karadzic, the wartime political leader of the Bosnian Serbs, has lost almost all of his power in the last year and has dropped from sight.

This week, rumors circulated in Europe that he was trying to negotiate terms for surrender to the international war crimes tribunal in The Hague.

"This could be very good news," an administration official said referring to the rumors, which he said Washington cannot confirm. "But, if not, it's only a matter of time."

Another administration official cautioned that it may take time to spring the trap on Karadzic. But he said the former Bosnian Serb president has virtually no chance of regaining his power.

After the 1995 Dayton, Ohio, conference that ended Bosnia's bloody ethnic war, many analysts, including top State Department officials, argued that the peace process would collapse if Karadzic and others indicted for war crimes remained at large.

But the Pentagon, and other NATO military commands, insisted that the first priority was to separate the warring factions and seize their heavy weapons, with any attempt to apprehend war criminals coming much later.

"It was a real hot debate," a State Department official said. "There were some who said you have to cut the head off the snake" and go after war criminals immediately.

nals immediately.

"I was one of them," the official said. "But the military's analysis was that this would have been risky, would have involved the loss of [U.S. and allied] soldiers and would have made things worse. This turned out to be right, so I have to swallow a rather big pill."

As would be fitting for a policy that stressed gradualism, the successes in the campaign to push to the margins and capture accused war criminals have been incremental, and, at times, almost imperceptible. But in contrast to the situation in November 1995, when the Dayton accords were concluded, there has been progress.

In the first 20 months after Dayton, forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization did not arrest a single indicted war criminal, although Karadzic taunted peacekeeping forces with regular public appearances and flouted provisions of the peace accords intended to bar him from politics.

The Pentagon's caution was regularly derided as a free pass given to the perpetrators of some of the worst atrocities in Europe in half a century.

But in the last eight months, the situation has changed: 30 suspects have been arrested or surrendered voluntarily, a number approaching half of the 77 people who have been indicted by the tribunal.

Karadzic lost his hold on television broadcasting in the Bosnian Serb entity, and a parliamentary election--held under intense pressure from the United States and its allies--installed a government led by his political foes.

U.S. officials say Karadzic is probably still in Pale, the former ski resort near Sarajevo that was his wartime capital.

But, a Pentagon official said, he has stopped using the telephone and other electronic means of communication and now communicates only by mail.

In the months immediately after the Dayton accords, NATO officials warned that

arresting Karadzic, Bosnian Serb Gen. Ratko Mladic or other high-profile war criminals would have touched off a new round of violence, probably aimed at international peacekeeping troops. No one believes that any longer because support for Karadzic has dissipated.

A State Department official said the NATO forces have established an unexpected level of credibility with all sides to the complex conflict by demonstrating an evenhanded approach.

If international troops had moved at once against war criminals, they would have appeared to be anti-Serb because by far the largest number of indictments were issued against Serbs, the official said. But now, the peacekeepers and the tribunal have gained a reputation for impartiality. Accused criminals from all three factions have surrendered or been apprehended.

"The war crimes tribunal has proved itself to be fair and just," the official said. "Three people were released for lack of evidence. There is one person who is out on bail. The word is spreading that you can get a fair trial there."

When two Bosnian Serb suspects were picked up this month, Bosnian Serb police

witnessed the arrests. U.S. officials say this is a sharp change from the situation a year ago when the police were loyal to Karadzic, and, in the words of a senior administration official, "were little more than roving bands practicing thuggery."

The turning point may have been last July 10, when British NATO troops arrested one war crimes suspect and killed another in a shootout in the town of Prijedor.

Although officials insist that the death of Simo Drljaca was not planned, they admit that it has had an effect on those under indictment, especially those who believe that the cases against them are thin.

Some experts outside the government say the administration's self-congratulation may be premature, though they agree that the noose is tightening around the 47 indicted war criminals who remain at large.

"There has been significant progress in terms of [Bosnian Serb] public reaction to Karadzic and the fact that he is a hindrance to the peace process," said John Heffernan of the Council for International Justice. "Since . . . Prijedor in July, there has been a heightened fear among those indicted. Karadzic has been less and less visible."

Los Angeles Times

April 12, 1998

Wife Adds to Rumors About Bosnian War-Crimes Suspect

BALKANS: His spouse says former rebel Serb leader Radovan Karadzic will never surrender to Hague tribunal.

By Tracy Wilkinson,
Times Staff Writer

BELGRADE, Yugoslavia--The wife of former Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic on Saturday added to the speculation surrounding her husband's possible surrender to a war crimes court, saying

Karadzic will "never" give himself up.

Ljiljana Karadzic's defense of her husband was echoed by his closest political ally, Momcilo Krajisnik, the Bosnian Serb member of Bosnia-Herzegovina's three-person presidency.

At the same time, however, reports in Belgrade suggested that Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic has been drawn into negotiations aimed at easing Karadzic's surrender.

The contradictions Saturday were typical of the past week's

swirl of speculation about whether Karadzic will end up at the international war crimes tribunal at The Hague, where he faces double indictment on genocide and related charges.

U.S. officials and diplomats in Bosnia and elsewhere in Europe are predicting that Karadzic's days of freedom are numbered.

"He will never, ever turn himself in voluntarily, and he will oppose any eventual attempt to arrest, illegally kidnap or capture him," Mrs. Karadzic said in a statement carried by the Bosnian Serb news agency, SRNA.

"Rumors" to the contrary, she said, are false.

"He will never recognize The Hague," which is merely laying the groundwork "not for trial but for a lynching and the condemnation of all Serbian people," she said.

Mrs. Karadzic said she was responding to statements in recent days by Western diplomats who maintain that Karadzic--increasingly isolated, with his paramilitary police hobbled by NATO--is attempting to set terms for his surrender to the tribunal in The Hague.

She said her husband has not authorized any appearances on his behalf before the court, but she did announce the formation of an "international committee" for the defense of Radovan Karadzic.

Mrs. Karadzic's statement should be taken with a grain of

salt. She is known for her fiercely loyal support of her husband, and her comments were clearly aimed at burnishing his honor and displaying the kind of defiance that was a hallmark of the anti-Western Karadzic leadership during 3 1/2 years of devastating war in Bosnia.

But speculation that Karadzic will soon surrender may also be premature.

His maneuvering room is certainly diminished, with military and political pressure on alleged war criminals growing and with Bosnian Serb moderates in the ascendant.

Yet, since the summer of last year, Karadzic has been floating trial balloons suggesting ways that he would be willing to stand trial. Nothing has come of those gestures.

Bosnian Serb President Biljana Plavsic, whose U.S.-backed challenge to Karadzic finally helped dislodge him from power, said last year that she had been asked to assist in efforts to find a face-saving way to get him to The Hague. Those efforts similarly failed to prosper.

Diplomats in Washington and in European capitals are especially eager to give credit to any overture from the Karadzic camp. Western political and military leaders, fearing casualties, have hoped to avoid having to arrest Karadzic.

Putting a different spin on matters, Krajisnik said Saturday in the Bosnian Serb town

of Pale that reports of an imminent surrender were without basis.

"All claims that [Karadzic] will surrender voluntarily have no foundation," Krajisnik said after a meeting with the U.S. ambassador to Bosnia, Richard Kauzlarich.

Contradicting Krajisnik's public statements, however, Belgrade newspapers said Saturday that Krajisnik reported to Milosevic on Thursday that Karadzic was willing to turn himself in under a number of conditions and that a proposal laying out the conditions will be presented to authorities in The Hague this week.

Other Karadzic associates have said he is most concerned about the treatment he would receive while in prison and that he wants guarantees he will not be drugged or abused.

One of Karadzic's several lawyers said late last week that no progress had been made in striking any deal on surrender conditions.

This latest round of speculation about Karadzic's intentions and actions began last month, when Carlos Westendorp, the senior Western diplomat in charge of Bosnian peacekeeping, told a meeting in Brussels that Karadzic would probably surrender this month.

A major show of force April 2 by North Atlantic Treaty Organization troops raiding a Pale police barracks, a short distance from Karadzic's home, stoked the suspicions.

NATO troops then arrested two Bosnian Serbs indicted by The Hague tribunal on charges of having run a concentration camp during the Bosnian war, which ended with U.S.-brokered peace accords in December 1995.

Formally, the court in The Hague does not "negotiate" with the suspects it has indicted. However, it has tacitly allowed third parties to do so in the past.

In October, the U.S. special envoy to the Balkans, Robert Gelbard, negotiated the surrender of 10 Bosnian Croats who had been indicted for the killing of Muslim civilians and other war crimes.

Among other terms, Gelbard promised the suspects quick trials, according to sources familiar with the discussions.

Bosnian Serb writer Momir Vojvodic, an associate of Karadzic's, said he met the former Bosnian Serb president last week in a "secret location" in Bosnia, the Belgrade daily Dnevni Telegraph reported Saturday.

Vojvodic quoted Karadzic as saying that he will go to The Hague when he is good and ready--and that he will name names if and when he goes.

"Karadzic has no intention of begging around the world for favorable conditions for his departure to The Hague," Vojvodic said. "He will go there of his own free will, when he estimates the moment has come to do that."

Dallas Morning News

April 11, 1998

NATO exercise in Bosnia: A warning to war-crimes suspects

Commanders describe movements as sign of determination to preserve peace, implement accord

By Ivica Profaca
Special Contributor to
The Dallas Morning News

GLAMOC, Bosnia-Herzegovina - Smoke rose over the Glamoc military range in western Bosnia as helicopters, airplanes, tanks and dozens of heavily armed soldiers swept through nearby hills in pursuit of the enemy.

Another war in the turbulent Balkans?

Not quite. Just the spectacular finish of a NATO-led exercise dubbed "Dynamic Response '98."

The exercise, which ended last week, involved a "strategic reserve force" of about 2,300 troops from the United States, Italy, the United Kingdom, Romania, Poland, the Netherlands and Turkey. Its purpose, commanders said, was to demonstrate NATO peacekeepers' determination to preserve the fragile peace in war-ravaged Bosnia-Herzegovina.

"By deploying the strategic reserve force and demonstrating its very powerful capabilities, the nations made a very powerful statement that peace will be kept, the [Dayton] agreement will be imple-

mented, and Bosnia-Herzegovina will rejoin the family of nations and be part of Europe," said U.S. Army Gen. Wesley Clark, supreme NATO commander, at a news conference at the conclusion of the exercise.

The NATO-led peacekeepers, the so-called Stabilization Force, or SFOR, was sent to Bosnia to guarantee provisions of the peace agreement reached in Dayton, Ohio, and signed in Paris in December 1995. That agreement split Bosnia into two entities, a Muslim-Croat Federation and the Serbian Republic.

Gen. Clark said Dynamic Response should serve as a warning to Serb and federation leaders that the international community will not allow fighting to restart.

"We've had peace in this country for two years, we've had progress in implementing the Dayton agreement, and that peace and that progress are going to continue," Gen. Clark said.

The two-week exercise began March 25 with the landing of 1,800 U.S. Marines in the Croatian port of Ploce. It included troop operations in

both the Muslim-Croat Federation and the Serbian Republic.

NATO commanders emphasized that the main purpose of the exercise was to train a rapid deployment force to back up peacekeepers in the event of trouble. But others viewed it as a show of force aimed at wartime Serb leader Radovan Karadzic and others indicted by an international tribunal on charges of war crimes during the three-year Bosnian war.

"U.S. Marines are not a bunch of beginners who need six months of hard training for this exercise, if their only goal was to be one live-fire demonstration and patrolling through a few Bosnian cities," said an editorial in the Croatian daily newspaper Slobodna Dalmacija.

Arresting war-crimes suspects "is not part of our mission," said Marine Capt. Mike Brown of Annadale, Va., during the Ploce landing. "But if we run into some of them, we

will turn them over to SFOR," he added.

Evidence of NATO's true objective during Dynamic Response, experts say, came on April 2, when about 500 soldiers, accompanied by armored personnel carriers and attack helicopters, surrounded Mr. Karadzic's house in the Bosnian Serb stronghold of Pale, a sleepy mountain village near Sarajevo.

Officially, the battalion-sized force was sent to Pale to inspect a special unit of the Bosnian Serb police, said SFOR spokesman Louis Garneau. But it also was seen as a warning to Mr. Karadzic, who is rumored to be seeking to negotiate terms for surrender to the tribunal.

Earlier this week, peacekeepers seized two Serbs accused of war crimes in connection with the notorious Omarska concentration camp near Prijedor in northwest Bosnia.

Gen. Clark acknowledged the renewed pursuit of war-

crimes suspects last week, during the news briefing that ended the NATO exercise.

"The whole international community has this message for the war-crime indictees - turn yourself in and go to The Hague," he said, referring to the Netherlands capital where the tribunal is located.

That message was punctuated on April 2, the final day of the exercise, with a combined strike by U.S. Apache and Cobra helicopters, Abrams tanks and Sea Harrier attack planes.

Thousands of rounds of ammunition, grenades, missiles and bombs were dropped onto the hills surrounding the Glamoc range, prompting high-ranking Bosnian military and civilian officials to use ear plugs against the manmade thunder.

However, not all of the observers were impressed by the military fireworks.

"This thunder can impress only those who don't know what the real fight is," Bosnian

Serb Defense Minister Manojlo Milovanovic said.

During the war, Mr. Milovanovic was a close associate of Gen. Ratko Mladic, Serbian military commander and, along with Mr. Karadzic, one of the most-wanted war-crimes suspects.

But Muslim Ejup Ganic, current leader of the collective federation presidency, took a different view.

"It was impressive to see all those forces, but they should be used for the right purpose, on places where war criminals are hiding," Mr. Ganic said.

The "strategic reserve force" left Bosnia-Herzegovina last weekend, but NATO-led peacekeepers will continue their mission knowing that they are not alone, Gen. Clark said.

"There is someone fully capable to help them only a radio signal away," he said.

Ivica Profaca is an editor of the Croatian newspaper Slobodna Dalmacija in Split.

Boston Globe

April 12, 1998

Pg. 2

Albanians in US fuel Kosovo struggle

Guerrillas battling Serbs for independence draw on overseas supporters to purchase weapons

By Colum Lynch,
Globe Correspondent

NEW YORK - Hassan, an apartment building superintendent in Manhattan's East Village, slips pictures of corpses into tenants' newspapers to bring attention to Serbian aggression against the ethnic Albanian majority in Kosovo province.

The crude political gesture by the Kosovar immigrant has angered residents and done little to further the cause of independence for his kin back home. So Hassan is joining a growing chorus of New York Kosovars who say it is no longer enough to tell the world about the plight of Kosovo: It's time to fight.

After a bloody crackdown by Serb authorities in their homeland, scores of Kosovar expatriates here are favoring a brand of radicalism endorsed by American supporters of the Irish Republican Army and the militant Islamic group Hamas.

The most zealous have begun to raise funds for the Kosovo Liberation Army, a guerrilla force that has stepped up armed attacks against the Serbian authorities in Kosovo in a bid for eventual independence.

"I prefer tough measures," said Hassan, who asked that his last name not be published. "Slobodan Milosevic is a criminal. He's a Hitler. He understands only force." Milosevic, former president of Serbia, is now president of the rump state of Yugoslavia, which consists of Serbia - including Kosovo - and Montenegro.

The call to arms by American-Kosovars marks a departure by a community whose politics have been peaceful: lobbying US politicians on behalf of their cause, organizing public demonstrations, raising funds for medicine, and financing political visits to the United States by Kosovar separatists.

And it has made life hell for

Rrustrem Ibraj, the 39-year-old president of the New York City chapter of the Kosovo Democratic League, a centrist political group in Kosovo seeking self-rule through peaceful means.

At political meetings at the party's Bronx headquarters, Ibraj has been derided as a naive pacifist. He has been deluged with requests from young ethnic Albanians to put them in contact with the armed resistance. Meanwhile, American supporters of the Kosovo Liberation Army have been crashing the league's meetings, appealing for contributions to a military fund.

"It is very hard for me to tell them to be calm," Ibraj said. "They say the only way to achieve our goal is to get arms and fight. I say I'm ready to die for Kosovo but Kosovo has not called for us."

The competition between Ibraj and the militants for the soul of New York's estimated 40,000 Kosovars mirrors a similar

struggle underway in Kosovo, where the leader of the Kosovo independence movement, Dr. Ibrahim Rugova, is straining to curb armed separatists from launching a war against the superior forces of Serbia.

As in Kosovo, the hard-line men in New York are gaining ground. Ibraj said the Kosovo Liberation Army's supporters - well-to-do New York immigrants who fled Kosovo during Communist rule - claim to have raised more than \$500,000 in recent months.

"Are there people who think the KLA is the way to go? Are they helping them? Yes," Ibraj said. "They have quite a lot of support here."

An American support network for the Kosovo Liberation Army emerges as American intelligence has detected an increase in arms smuggling to the insurgents in Kosovo, according to a State Department official. The weapons have been financed by Kosovar ex-

iles in Europe, and more recently in the United States, and funneled through ethnic Albanian sympathizers in neighboring Albania and Macedonia.

For the moment, most of New York's Kosovars are placing their faith in American power to advance their goals.

They have been encouraged by Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright, who warned that the world will not stand by in the face of Serbian aggression against Kosovo's ethnic Albanians, who account for 90 percent of Kosovo's 2 million people.

Washington Post

April 13, 1998

Pg. 21

In the Loop

By Al Kamen

Openings at Pentagon?

Dust off those resumes, there may still be openings at the Pentagon. First there's word that the favored candidate for Army secretary, Louis Caldera, now deputy director of the Corporation for National Service, has some supporters thinking he might move to another spot: namely deputy in-

terior secretary, replacing John Garamendi. Garamendi was "Mr. California," handling that state's hot enviro issues, and some out there want him replaced by another Californian. Caldera is a former California state assemblyman.

Florida state Sen. Daryl Jones's nomination to be Air Force secretary is stalled while federal investigators look into reports that he lobbied the Miami-Dade County Commission to give a \$200 million bond contract to Douglas James Se-

curities while he was on the company's payroll. Given the Senate's schedule this year, any delay could be costly.

Finally, there's Navy Secretary John H. Dalton, whom Defense Secretary William S. Cohen's folks are said to have wanted out now. But Dalton has too much juice in the White House. So he's staying probably until the end of the year. Which is when Rep. Paul McHale (D-Pa.), a former Marine, is leaving Congress. Hey! McHale's Navy?

Washington Times

April 13, 1998

Pg. 11

North and South Korea to talk about family exchanges

By Andrew Browne
REUTERS NEWS AGENCY

BEIJING — North Korean negotiators holding talks with the rival South agreed yesterday to discuss allowing reunions among millions of families separated since the 1950-53 Korean War.

Progress in the first high-level contact between the two Koreas in four years followed a blunt message by the South that large-scale aid to its famine-stricken neighbor depends on political concessions.

Talks that began on Saturday in Beijing moved to a working level to discuss family reunions along with Southern proposals to exchange envoys and reopen liaison offices in the border truce village of Panmunjom.

Also on the agenda was implementation of the 1991 Basic Agreement to pursue peaceful reunification.

The Korean Peninsula is split by razor wire and minefields under a 1953 armistice, which left the North and South technically at war. Time is running out for many aging Koreans with relatives across the border.

North Korean delegates emerged after almost two hours of working talks and said negotiations would resume today.

"There is still quite a distance between the two sides," North Korean chief delegate Chun Kumchul said.

South Korea's chief negotiator, Vice Minister for National Unification Jeong Se-hyun, said earlier that he was "neither optimistic nor pessimistic" about the outcome.

He welcomed the working-level talks as "a sign of North Korean willingness to resolve many issues."

Meanwhile, the head of the

World Food Program said in Beijing that six out of 10 North Korean children are born underweight and three of those six die.

"All one has to do is to see skeletal children in the hospitals to know that this not only is the state of some of the children, but that they reflect the state of their families and their mothers and fathers," Catherine Bertini told a news conference after visiting North Korea.

Yet, Miss Bertini said, the WFP and North Korean authorities are wrangling over monitoring of aid.

She said the WFP had threatened to cut back relief deliveries after Pyongyang barred its inspectors from 50 of the country's 210 counties where it said there were sensitive military installations.

Pyongyang has now agreed to let

monitors into the areas within 30 days, Miss Bertini said.

Earlier, the French humanitarian group Doctors Without Borders issued a report that said army and government officials were stealing international relief supplies, and only a bare minimum was getting through to the sick and dying.

The report, based on interviews with North Korean refugees and Chinese travelers, spoke of cannibalism among North Korea's desperate population of 23 million.

Pyongyang had sought the current Beijing talks to ask for as much as 200,000 tons of fertilizer.

Three years of floods and drought have exacerbated the damage caused by disastrous policies of collectivized farming.

Pacific Stars & Stripes

April 14, 1998

Pg. 3

Annual exercise scheduled in ROK

Stripes Seoul Bureau

SEOUL — This year's ROK-U.S. Combined Forces Command exercise, called RSOI for Reception, Staging, Onward movement and Integration, will be held April 23-29.

The command announced

Monday that the drill will involve about 7,000 U.S. and South Korean forces.

RSOI tests the ability to bring reinforcements and supplies into South Korea in time of war, spokesman Jim Coles said.

RSOI is one of three major training exercises held by CFC each year. The others are Ulchi Focus Lens, held in late summer, and Foal Eagle in the fall.

Philadelphia Inquirer

April 13, 1998

Pg. 4

A small eastern German town unveiled a stone monument yesterday to U.S. soldiers who helped liberate the Buchenwald concentration camp in 1945. The monument in Hottelstedt, near Weimar in former East-Germany, commemorates when a U.S. patrol on April 11, 1945, came upon Russian prisoners who had escaped the camp and who told the Americans of an inmate insurrection there.

Commander backs call for more closures**WILSON SAYS BRAC ROUNDS WILL CUT ALMOST HALF OF ALL AMC INSTALLATIONS**

The Army Materiel Command in particular, and the service in general, cannot properly execute assigned missions under today's fiscal conditions -- and the only way to remedy this situation is to increase defense spending or close more bases, asserts AMC's commanding officer. That means AMC may lose nearly half its installations.

According to Gen. Johnnie Wilson, the Army Materiel Command can no longer maintain needed personnel levels or, more importantly, appropriate standards for infrastructure; funding reductions have been too deep and existing monies do not stretch far enough.

While efforts to streamline are under way, they cannot fill the gap, making an increase in the overall budget necessary, he says. Barring that, Wilson believes Congress must authorize another BRAC round, which will eliminate nearly half of all AMC installations over the next decade.

"We will probably let go 3,000 people throughout the Army Materiel Command in '98 due to budget cuts," he told *Inside the Army*. All will be civilians and even leading facilities such as White Sands Missile Range, NM, will take a hit. Two weeks ago, 240 WSMR employees were let go under voluntary early retirement; another 113 will be trimmed through involuntary separation.

Despite the personnel reductions and other efficiencies, Wilson emphasizes important portions of the AMC mission will not be accomplished. For example, it will be extraordinarily difficult to update White Sands under current budget levels, although it is considered a critical test facility.

"The challenge we have from a funding point is we have 62 locations in the continental United States. At each of those locations there is a base operating cost, there is an infrastructure cost. Going back to White Sands, if you asked me how much I need to take care of my infrastructure requirements today, I'd probably tell you I need \$117-plus million," he stated. "Those are the buildings and the testing tools we need, and the other facilities. "White Sands is probably the premier test range in America, but when you look at the facilities out there and the test equipment, it's clearly outdated and desperately in need of repair," Wilson lamented.

Base operations accounts are also in dire need of help, he feels, and the need will only grow as the service turns to outsourcing ventures, such as Apache Prime Vendor Support, which remove funding from accounts such as flight hours, a pool of money often used by commanders to cover other expenses like standard of living increases.

"I think that, as an Army, we have to find a way to get an increase in the top line and help increase the base operations budget," Wilson stated. "Because, you see, I take an awful hit, because they say we spend a lot of dollars in logistics, 'you're very costly.' So when I go and run the numbers, in fact, for [the bases] to survive, they migrate a lot of dollars into base ops. You can't beat up on me then for being so expensive, right?"

"Now again, I know the reality because I end up doing the same thing," Wilson continued. "What you have to do is take the dollars you've got and be as creative as you can and spread them to take care of the soldiers, to take care of readiness. But when we move to these programs [like PVS], there are concerns about them because we're going to reduce the dollars that are currently available to [commanders] to migrate," he remarked.

"Commanders are going to have to realign their accounts and make sure the dollars that are given to him [go toward his needs]. It gets back to the fact that someone has to listen to us and increase the top line to take care of infrastructure," Wilson stated. "I mean we just can't stop talking. They say 'generals, stop whining.' Well, there's a reason for me to whine."

Wilson also told *Inside the Army* he feels the Defense Department should increase the Army's overall share of the defense budget (*ITA*, April 6, p1).

He admits, though, that this is unlikely. "The reality is that we, as a nation, have signed up for this balanced budget. So when you mention \$250 billion, I don't know if you're going to see a major increase to that number."

The only other answer is base closures: "As a military, we can't afford to keep all these installations," Wilson asserted. "We need a BRAC to begin to close installations. That's a very painful process, [especially] with the election year. But you have to find a way."

The Army Materiel Command must bear a significant share of any BRAC round, Wilson continued. "My goal is to go from 62 [AMC installations] to 39 by the year 2010. Keep in mind, now, we had 789,000 people in 1989," he noted. "Now we have 495,000 and we're going down to 480,000. So as you decrease the end strength, you've got to make sure you can decrease the infrastructure as well to keep up. And again, that budget is there."

Without the closures, Wilson warns the Army will continue to suffer, and likely in ways that will harm its future stability and strength.

"I talk about 62 installations for the Army Materiel Command alone and we pay for them out of four different accounts. So, when I take money out of the science and technology account to pay for base operations at about seven or eight of those installations, then I'm decreasing the S&T account. We can't afford to lose the edge we have in science and technology," Wilson admonished. "We are leap years ahead of many countries, but you can't afford to reduce that account -- you'll look up one year and you'll be in trouble. And you can't stop and start technology like that."

"So how do you fix it?" he asked. "Well, in the end the way you've got to fix it is close the doggone installations or increase the top line."

And, while Congress has indicated it will not support additional BRAC rounds in the near future, Wilson regards it as the more

likely of the funding crunch solutions.

"I think that right now Congress is beating up on us big time, and saying to the secretary of defense, 'Mr. Cohen, we hear you but we're not going to take up any BRAC activity any time soon,'" he remarked. "Sooner or later, once you get past all the emotion and Congress begins to have hearings on this issue, then I think they'll grant it." -- *Erin Q. Winograd*

Washington Times April 13, 1998

Pg. 12



By Betsy Pisik in New York

Iraq voices high hopes

Iraq expects U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan to issue a positive report soon on the first round of weapons inspections of its so-called presidential sites, an influential Baghdad daily said yesterday.

Al-Thawra, organ of the ruling Ba'ath party, said the first or "baseline" visits that ended on

April 3 showed that nothing was found at the eight palaces, the focus of a crisis this winter with the U.N. inspectors.

A February deal between Mr. Annan and Baghdad averted U.S. military strikes after Iraqi authorities barred inspectors of the U.N. Special Commission (UNSCOM), mandated with dismantling Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, from the sites.

"The United Nations secretary-general will submit very soon a report to the Security Council on the results of visits by the special commission to the presidential sites in Iraq. No doubt this report will be positive," al-Thawra said.

"The visit to these sites took place amid complete cooperation from the Iraqi authorities, which

everyone acknowledged."

It said the U.N. secretary-general and his representative in Baghdad, Prakash Shah, had expressed satisfaction with Iraq's cooperation, as had U.N. Undersecretary-General for Disarmament Affairs Jayantha Dhanapala, who headed a team of senior diplomats accompanying the inspectors on the visits.

"The most important result of these visits is that the team did not find in the presidential sites any of what the American and British governments claimed was there," said the al-Thawra article.

But a U.N. report last week said Iraq was still failing to provide a full account of its biological warfare program.

• Betsy Pisik can be reached by e-mail (unear@aol.com).

New York Times
April 13, 1998

For Gay Soldiers, Service Means Lying

To the Editor:

Andrew Sullivan's criticism of the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy (Op-Ed, April 9) is on the mark. "Don't ask, don't tell" is based on the precept that it is O.K. to admit gay service members and then compel them to live a lie.

The military forces gay soldiers constantly to pretend that they are straight, not just with their peers but even with their parents, friends and loved ones. The policy preserves no privacy or dignity for gay service members. It is a violation of our military's tradition of honor, integrity and respect.

TOBIAS B. WOLFF
Seattle, April 9, 1998

To the Editor:

Re "The Trouble With 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'" (editorial, April 8), on the Defense Department report showing that the number of homosexuals being forced out of the military under the policy is higher than when the policy was adopted in 1993:

You say the "Pentagon spin is that service members are voluntarily declaring them-

selves gay to get out of the military." You go on to ask, "But if that were true, wouldn't discharge numbers have stayed roughly the same from year to year?" This ignores several realities.

There is less stigma associated with homosexuality today, so new recruits who find the military tougher than expected can claim to be homosexual and get an honorable discharge with taxpayer-financed transition benefits. Veterans use the same excuse to gain their freedom to pursue careers in a robust economy, and a growing number escape obligations after expensive taxpayer-financed legal and medical schooling.

Meanwhile, military recruiting and retention are severe problems.

ROBERT L. MAGINNIS
Director, Military Readiness
Project Family Research
Council
Washington, April 8, 1998

To the Editor:

Andrew Sullivan ("Undone by 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell,'" Op-Ed, April 9) doesn't want to admit that maybe it was the gay movement that made the false step. Imagine if gay men and lesbians had "just said no" to marriage and being admitted into the military: the right wing would have come down on us

as un-American and not abiding by our responsibility to the country.

Conservatives would have said that we were immoral for not wanting those things. The gay movement should have invented new forms of commitment and military service. It seems we missed a huge opportunity.

STEVEN SCOTT SMITH
New York, April 10, 1998

To the Editor:

"The Trouble With 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'" (editorial, April 8) is perhaps more than what meets the eye. This policy, along with the Defense of Marriage Act, makes President

Clinton -- however unintentionally -- the most antigay chief executive on record.

But what is even more distressing is when the Human Rights Campaign Fund, a major gay rights group, honors President Clinton at a gala dinner and showers him with a level of respect that he has merely pretended to show us in exchange for our votes.

TIMOTHY LANE
New York, April 8, 1998

Editor's Note: The op-ed referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, April 9, 1998, Pg. 11; the editorial referred to appeared April 8, 1998, Pg. 11.

U.S. News & World Report April 20, 1998

Pg. 9

Water bombs

A fiery battle for water rights is heating up again between Syria and Turkey. The Syrians, whose own internal water reserves have been heavily depleted, fear that Turkish plans to construct a network of dams and power stations along the Euphrates River will cut off Syria's only other major water supply.

To thwart the Turkish plans, say Mideast intelligence sources, the Syrians are helping members of the anti-Turkish Kurdish terrorist organization

PKK train for the sabotage of the giant Birecik Dam now under construction in Turkey near the Syrian border. According to the sources, the sabotage plan is based on technical blueprints of the dam project smuggled out of Turkey just four months ago.

The plan is being coordinated, they say, by PKK leader Abdullah Ocalan and senior Army officers assigned by the boss of Syrian military intelligence. A simulated attack on a dummy installation took place in mid-February near Syria's Lake Quatina.

Cohen's base-closing dilemma resonates with Andrews

By Steve Campbell
Staff Writer

WASHINGTON - Tom Andrews seems somewhat amused these days by reports that Defense Secretary William Cohen is trying to close more military bases.

It's no wonder. Seven years ago, Andrews, who was then a Democratic congressman from Maine, took a political beating when he voted to close Loring Air Force Base in northern Maine and 30 other military facilities.

It wasn't an easy vote: Maine's three other political leaders in Congress, including Cohen, protested the decision to close Loring. Their staffs portrayed Andrews as a traitor, unwilling to fight for Maine jobs.

Andrews took a different view: He decided that the independent panel that recommended closing Loring had considered Loring's case fairly and that it was time for northern Maine to plan for a new economic future.

These days, in one of those ironic twists in life, Cohen may wish there were more politicians like Andrews on Capitol Hill.

Last year, the Senate rejected Cohen's call to close unneeded bases. He'd prefer to use the money to modernize weapons systems. Last week, Cohen resurrected the idea and was greeted with a yawn on Capitol Hill.

So far, Maine's current political leaders in Congress, fearing that bases in Brunswick or Kittery might be targeted, have rejected Cohen's plea. But Andrews is praising Cohen's decision; he said Cohen is acting in the best interests of the nation.

"The Defense Department must be first and foremost about the defense of the country. It's not first and foremost a jobs program," said Andrews, who works as a consultant for liberal causes in Washington.

However, Andrews said Cohen's ability to persuade Congress could be weakened by Cohen's past opposition to

closing bases.

"It puts him in a difficult position to go to the very same (legislative) body that he served in and ask his former colleagues to take a position he refused to take," Andrews said.

As a Maine congressman in 1976, Cohen wrote and helped pass legislation that made it all but impossible for the military to close bases. As Fred Barnes, a columnist for The New Republic, wrote in 1991: "(Cohen) succeeded not only in protecting Loring, but in preventing

the Pentagon from closing any major base for 11 years, scores of which have been obsolete since World War II, some since the Indian wars a century ago."

As for the future, Andrews said the chances that Congress will close more bases "range anywhere from zero to zero." Even so, Andrews said, it's important that Cohen focus on the issue so Americans understand the extent of the problem. "If he does that, then I think the pressure would mount. Then, and only then, would it have a

chance of passing," he said.

Andrews' vote on Loring contributed to his defeat in a race for the U.S. Senate in 1994. His rival, Olympia Snowe, successfully argued that he would not fight for Maine's interests, and pointed to the Loring case as an example. But to this day, Andrews said, he doesn't regret what he did.

"I'd rather make the right decision and lose than make the wrong decision and win," he said.

Boston Globe

April 11, 1998

Pg. 6

Cohen urges safety changes

By Matthew Brelis
and Stephen Kurkjian
Globe Staff

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen said he believes the military should make public the causes of air crashes, a move that safety advocates said should help prevent accidents.

Cohen said that while he favors the current system, under which military personnel must testify fully but in confidence to crash investigators, it should not prevent the release of information on causes of crashes.

The military has always kept confidential the causes of its crashes, as well as the official recommendations of investigators. The services do make public the details of their "legal investigations," which identify who was at fault in crashes.

"I think as far as causes are concerned, that information should be made public," Cohen said. "Personally, when you talk of causation, the matter should be a matter of public disclosure."

The secretary said he would await the recommendations of a task force on government reorganization, chaired by Vice President Al Gore, before deciding how to implement the change.

Cohen's remarks, which came in an interview with Globe editors and reporters, were applauded by Alan Diehl,

a former Air Force safety specialist and a strong critic of the safety levels inside the military.

"Making the causes of these accidents public would mean everyone, from commander to pilot to mechanic, would know that a problem had been identified and what to look out for in the future," Diehl said. "It can only help in saving lives."

Cohen indicated he was also concerned that the families of men and women who died in military crashes be told as much as possible about the causes of the disasters. He said many relatives of the 19 American airmen killed in a 1996 terrorist bombing at their housing complex in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, expressed frustration with the US government's reluctance to share information.

"There really wasn't an attempt to get them the answers in a way in which we'd expect," Cohen said. He said he was exploring the possibility of

putting in place a Pentagon "ombudsman" who might tell family members "here's what we know, here's what we don't know, (and) here's why this was covered up."

A Globe series last year focused on the heavy toll taken by peacetime accidents in the US military. Among other things, the series found that the military often overlooks or delays the installation of safety equipment. Cohen said yesterday that he intended to make certain that the services find enough money to install such equipment.

Cohen said the armed services have moved too slowly to install safety equipment, such as a system to avoid midair collisions, in their aircraft.

Cohen said the Department of Defense would seek waivers from Congress to allow the system to be installed on airplanes that are within five years of retirement.

GERRY ADAMS APPEALED to IRA backers to accept the Irish peace accord.

Extremists on both sides of Northern Ireland's sectarian divide remain a threat to the historic agreement hammered out in marathon talks last week. It includes some power-sharing mechanisms and Ireland's renunciation of territorial claims to the British province. Next come twin referendums in Ulster and the rest of Ireland May 22. Clinton may visit beforehand. With investors wary, a peace dividend may be small and slow in coming.

Wall Street
Journal
April 13, 1998
Pg. 1

Defusing Kosovo

THE EXPLOSIVENESS of Kosovo is being met by an international effort to launch a political alternative. The so-called contact group -- which includes the United States, Russia and Europe -- is pushing Serbia to accept outside mediation in its dispute with its restless province. Serbia is resisting mediation, fearing it will suffer disadvantage. Kosovo welcomes mediation, hoping to turn the contact group's favor for autonomy into broader international support for independence.

It is shortsighted of Serbia to dig in its heels on this issue. It makes a case, one widely recognized, against Kosovan independence, which everyone realizes would mean the partial dismemberment of Serbia. The contact group, which in this instance is providing a model of American-Russian cooperation, supports this stand. But the more the Serbs resist the idea of mediation to restore Kosovan autonomy, the less international support they can expect for their opposition to Kosovan independence. This would not be the first time Serbia's Slobodan Milosevic had over-

reached.

Too often forgotten, however, is that Serbia has a deep and legitimate concern for the welfare of the small Serbian minority (about 10 percent) in Kosovo. Yugoslav President Milosevic may have grossly evaded his responsibility to shelter the now-aroused Albanian ethnic majority in the province: There lies a powerful argument for its autonomy. But Mr. Milosevic retains both a politician's and a head of state's obligation to that Serbian minority. Its resident Serbs are the neglected core of the crisis in Kosovo.

Two ways are open to care for them. Serbia, as the governing authority, can make an effort to reach into Kosovo. No one can reasonably expect Serbia to ignore an isolated slice of its own kin. Or the Kosovo Albanians can come forward and accept responsibility for fair and equal treatment of all the inhabitants of the territory they claim as their own. Some combination of both approaches would seem best suited to keep this already-trembling Balkan corner from exploding into a conflict whose costs could rival the agonies of Bosnia.

International Herald Tribune

April 11-12, 1998

The Pentagon Belatedly Discovers the Drawback of Monopolies

By William Pfaff
Los Angeles Times Syndicate,
International Herald Tribune

PARIS - The natural tendency of the unregulated marketplace is to produce monopolies. Monopolies serve their own interests, which may not be those of the consumer.

Defenders of market doctrine will naturally challenge this by saying that monopolies are self-canceling because they provoke new competitors to enter the market with better products or services.

The latest to discover that in crucial cases this reassuring theory is not true is the U.S. Department of Defense. In late March, the United States filed suit to block Lockheed Martin from purchasing Northrop Grumman. It claimed that this \$12 billion acquisition "would result in substantially less, and in several cases eliminate, competition in major markets critical to the national defense."

That represents a striking reversal in Defense Department policy. Since 1993 the Pentagon has not only promoted but even subsidized mergers in the U.S. aerospace industry, following another fashionable theory about the demands of the globalized marketplace.

In 1993 the secretary of defense at the time, William Perry, demanded a huge restructuring in America's defense industry on the ground that only enormous conglom-

erates would have the resources and efficiencies of scale to produce, at acceptable costs, what American forces would need in the 21st century.

Industry responded, and there now are only two major military aerospace producers in the United States, Lockheed Martin and Boeing. Lockheed's purchase of Northrop Grumman would logically complete a vast realignment that the Pentagon said it wanted.

These maneuvers in the American defense industry have convinced West European politicians and military aerospace manufacturers that, to survive, they too must merge. The European Union has told the major companies to produce a plan for this.

What changed the Defense Department's mind was its discovery that instead of creating a hypercompetitive aerospace industry, it had, at considerable taxpayer expense, overseen the creation of quasi-monopoly suppliers that it cannot control.

Before, the Pentagon had dealt with the defense manufacturers from a position of power. They had to compete on design and costs to get contracts. Now, their survival is assured, and their corporate and stockholder interest is in maximizing profits.

Ann Markusen, of New York's Council on Foreign Relations, published an analysis saying this last year.

"Although the mergers have

been rationalized as cost-saving moves," she wrote, "they have been chiefly motivated by expectations of short-term financial gains and long-term enhanced market power and political clout."

The industry is now answerable to Wall Street demands for steadily increasing quarterly profits that will meet the approval of fund managers and push the stock price up. Without intending it, the Pentagon has made the defense industry into just another American business accountable to Wall Street.

Moreover, when a company is a quasi-monopoly producer, with a single prime customer, stockholder value does not come from research and innovation, but from selling to that captive customer the goods you already produce and have already amortized.

The theories about self-canceling monopolies do not work when the product is high-performance military aircraft, commercial transport aircraft or space vehicles, since virtually no private corporation has the capital to start up in these businesses and provide competition.

Even if the capital existed, the stock market would not permit a company to invest in the development of complex, high-risk and extremely expensive products that could not become profitable for decades. The time-span is not a com-

mercial one.

Europe is in the aerospace business today only because certain European governments put up enormous sums of money to create the European Airbus consortium and the Ariane space launcher. Both are successful, but are only now paying off the government investments and loans given at the beginning of the 1970s. No commercial investor would have supplied the necessary capital over such a period.

The Pentagon has discovered the hard way that the market is a mechanism for making money for investors and managers. It is not a self-correcting system that ultimately serves the public interest, as some have seemed to think.

It is not even patriotic, since its natural tendency is toward international consolidation. The head of Lockheed Martin, Vance Coffman, called for internationalization of the industry at the annual Wehrkunde conference on military issues in Munich in February.

However, his predecessor, Norman Augustine, who actually restructured Lockheed, now asks what would happen if "national" defense were internationalized.

"If industry is to globalize, who will decide what is to be sold to whom?" he said.

"Should the U.S. let itself become technologically dependent on offshore software and

electronics?"

They are important questions that go against the logic of the marketplace. They serve to emphasize that the public interest must control the marketplace, and not, as seems to have happened here, the reverse.

Defense News

April 13-19, 1998

Pg. 2

Special Operations Force Faces Computer Assault

The U.S. Army is monitoring a month-long attack on computer systems owned by the Special Operations Forces Command, Maj. Gen. John Thomas, commanding general of the

Army's Intelligence and Security Command, said April 6.

"There is an attack on a Special Operations Forces system that we have been watching for a month or so," Thomas said during an April 6-8 Association of the United States Army symposium at Pinehurst, N.C.

Chicago Tribune

April 12, 1998

Pg. 1

The Start Of The 'American Century'

U.S. tenure as the world's 800-pound gorilla has its limits

By R.C. Longworth
Tribune Staff Writer

The word is hegemon. Get used to it. It means Numero Uno, Mr. Big, the 800-pound gorilla.

If you're an American, it means you.

In the six years since the Soviet Union vanished into history, Americans have become used to thinking of their country as "the last remaining superpower" or "the most powerful nation on the globe." But even these superlatives don't begin to define how other nations see the United States and the degree to which this country literally dominates the world.

"The 'American Century' is not over," said German editor and scholar Josef Joffe. "It has just begun."

America has been a superpower for a half-century. The difference now is the scope. The Cold War once limited American penetration to half the globe, and even there American ideas were challenged not only by the Kremlin but by neutralist governments, by Marxist academics or by state-controlled media.

Now, with the Kremlin defeated, Marxists in disarray and communications leaping frontiers into satellite dishes around the globe, the competition simply has vanished.

Former Warsaw Pact members line up to join American-led NATO. American ships prowl every ocean unchallenged. American markets and multinationals dominate the new global economy. When Asia collapsed in financial turmoil last fall, it was Washington -- not Tokyo or Beijing --

that led the rescue.

American lawyers write the laws in the Czech Republic. American journalists advise newspapers in Kazakhstan. American evangelical Protestants rally believers in countries like Russia, where Orthodox Christian's once reigned unchallenged, or in Roman Catholic Latin America.

To some American leaders, U.S. power is virtually unlimited, and that's fine.

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, justifying the Clinton administration's threat to bomb Iraq, said, "If we have to use force, it is because we are America. We are the indispensable nation. We stand tall. We see further into the future."

In fact, this power has limits. Albright notably failed to win world support for an attack on Iraq. In the end, the administration accepted United Nations mediation. But no other nation could even have dreamed of going halfway around the world to chastise another nation that was not, after all, directly threatening the U.S.

This power will be on display this week at the International Monetary Fund meeting in Washington. The IMF has 182 members but is virtually commanded by the U.S., which framed and led the IMF's bailout last autumn of Asian nations, even while Congress was balking at contributing to it.

When Japan looks at the world, it sees a "Pax Americana" that will last "through the first decades of the 21st Century," according to Takashi Inoguchi, a political scientist at the University of Tokyo. "The supremacy of the United States

is felt even more strongly than in the past."

And nothing -- not Japanese wealth, not Russian weapons, not European culture, not the power of a billion Chinese -- will challenge it, in Inoguchi's view.

"We have no rivals," said former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski. "Not Europe within the next 25 years. Russia will be a regional power at most, and that's a big if. China? No. At best a regional power. And Japan is no superstate."

A superpower is the leader of its allies, with power and duties in its sphere of influence; during the Cold War, America's sway spanned half the globe. But a hegemon straddles the world -- militarily, politically, economically -- and sees opportunities and responsibilities virtually everywhere.

The kind of clout is nearly unprecedented. Several scholars have pointed out that no one capital has so dominated the world since the Roman Empire.

"Never before in modern history has a country dominated the Earth so totally as the United States does today," said Der Spiegel, a German news magazine.

In some parts of the globe this power is welcome.

"The U.S. stands above the rest," but it's a "benign hegemon," a Singapore foreign ministry official said. "The fundamental impulse in Southeast Asia is to say, 'Yankee, stay here,' rather than 'Yankee, go home.'"

Central and South Americans, long used to U.S. dominance, say that, for the first time this century, no country in

the region -- with the possible exception of Cuba -- fears an American invasion. A poll found that two-thirds of Panamanians want American troops to stay there after the U.S. turns over control of the Panama Canal at the end of 1999.

In Azerbaijan, Vafa Gulizade, the foreign policy adviser to the president, said the government of that tiny, potentially oil-rich nation looks to the U.S., 7,000 miles away, to protect it from the Russians and Iranians next door.

Asked if he doesn't fear an American economic colonization, Gulizade said this "will be better than before," when Azerbaijan, now independent, was part of the Soviet Union. "The United States dominates in many parts of the world, but it's not a criminal regime, like the one we used to live with."

For some, the prospect of a powerful United States towering like Godzilla over the international landscape stirs fear, even paranoia.

Chinese officials accuse the U.S. of framing its Asia policy to contain China.

"What have we done wrong?" said a Chinese scholar. "The suspicion is that there is a kind of international conspiracy against us, led by the United States."

Russian leaders, according to Moscow television executive Alexei Pushkov, are just coming to terms with their new, diminished stature but "are clear about what they don't want to have: a world based on a dominant U.S. leadership which would border hegemony."

"Power, hubris and greed are the sins of ... Western hegemony led by the United States," said Kanti Bajpai at Jawaharlal Nehru University in New Delhi. "On virtually every issue of concern to India, the U.S. has veto ... power, whether it is on nuclear, tech-

nological, economic, environmental and political matters. The U.S. can deny India its objectives and can rally others to join it in punishing India."

To be a superpower means to be the strongest among other powers, to be on top of the standings in the global game. It's a precarious perch, as the Russians found out.

That's why the scholars don't call the United States a superpower anymore, because nobody's challenging American supremacy.

The new word is hegemon, which means undisputed leader, a dominant power.

A hegemon stands larger than life. America gets the credit or the blame for everything, whether it deserves it or not. From Bangkok to the Balkans, nations see the fine American hand behind every event. Little happens in the world until other countries check to see what Washington thinks about it and plans to do about it.

Sometimes, this power is positive. Because of U.S. pressure, NATO forces went into Bosnia-Herzegovina and the International Monetary Fund bailed out Mexico during its debt crisis in 1994-95. Sometimes, it's negative. The U.S. shot down a Japanese plan for an Asian fund to rescue East Asian nations caught in a new debt crisis last year, and it refused to sign a global treaty banning land mines.

In short, the United States doesn't always get what it wants, but it can usually keep anything it doesn't want from happening.

"American power is broad but often shallow," said Brzezinski. "U.S. power may be decisive, but it's not enough to impose an order on the world."

Part of this hegemonic power is military. The U.S. arms budget is nearly as big as those of the next six most powerful nations combined; it is double the defense budgets of all of its conceivable enemies put together.

Part of it is economic. The United States is the headquarters of the global economy. It has the biggest money markets, bond markets, stock markets. Japanese banks and corporations may be bigger, but in-

creasingly the rule book for the global economy is being written by American regulators, bankers, executives and lawyers.

"We don't want independence. We want prosperity," said Carlos Andres Escude, an adviser to the Argentine government. "Playing ball with the United States means playing ball with American private actors -- bankers, stockbrokers -- and this is as important as going along with the American government itself."

Part of it is institutional. The U.S. either is host to the major global organizations -- the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund -- or dominates them, as it does NATO or the World Trade Organization.

"The genius of American diplomacy in the second half of this century," said Joffe, "was building institutions that would advance American interests by serving others."

Part of it is cultural. American ideas and values wing in on the coattails of American movies, McDonald's and Pizza Huts, international editions of Time and Playboy magazines, all amplified by global communications. The Internet speaks English, with an American accent.

This cultural penetration is more than skin deep. American universities take in hundreds of thousands of foreign students, many of them future leaders who will take American ideas on feminism or the environment with them when they go home. American think tanks, foundations and non-governmental organizations set up shop around the globe, teaching not only American accounting and medicine but American philosophies on how to run a hospital, an economy or a nation.

Despite 50 years of experience at leading half the world, the U.S. still finds it difficult to strike a balance between humility, however hypocritical, and outright braggadocio.

The rest of the world cringes at displays of American triumphalism, like the Atlanta Olympic Games in 1996 or the Denver summit in 1997, when President Clinton crowed about U.S. economic strength and

tried to force European leaders like German Chancellor Helmut Kohl to put on cowboy boots.

American overreach often exasperates its allies. The Helms-Burton Act, which would punish some non-American firms doing business with Cuba, is an attempt to apply American law to business by non-Americans outside America; it infuriates the Europeans, among others.

Either Congress or the administration has imposed or threatened economic sanctions against countries holding one-third of humanity. Often, as in Iran, even America's closest friends simply ignore these sanctions, preferring U.S. wrath to the loss of business there.

At the same time, foreign governments, newspapers and pundits regularly react in alarm to any sign that the U.S. might be going isolationist.

American policymakers, all veterans of the Cold War, must cope now with this brand new world. The Clinton administration has seized this opportunity for expansion of American influence with both hands.

Celebrating "America's unique capabilities and unmatched powers," Albright has said that America "must remain a European power" and "a Pacific power," must lead Russia to democracy, must promote peace in the Middle East, "must continue shaping a global economic system that works for America," must "fight and win the war against international crime," "must stand up to international terror," must "fight hunger, control disease, care for refugees and ensure the survival of infants and children."

"America should be leading the way," Albright said, "when it comes to the rights of more than half the people on Earth."

Albright's deputy, Strobe Talbott, added that "in order to keep our streets safe, we must attack sources of crime at the far ends of the Earth. We must also act globally to address environmental problems that affect us here at home."

Clinton has hailed American leadership "from Belfast to Jerusalem ... from Prague to Port-au-Prince ... from Kuwait to Sarajevo."

Nor is this all. American diplomats are involved in ending the division of Cyprus. They are trying to bring about a political solution in Northern Ireland. They are balancing China and Taiwan, Armenia and Azerbaijan, India and Pakistan, Tutsi and Hutu.

Joffe, the German editor, called this "the most expansive definition of U.S. interests in the postwar record."

In the eyes of many critics, this platform is all ambition and no policy.

"Simply put, the president lacks a long-term vision," Jacques Attali, an adviser to the late French President Francois Mitterrand, wrote in the magazine Foreign Policy. "Clinton has (called) for the worldwide spread of democracy and free markets. As necessary as that may be, it does not provide an architecture for international relations in the 21st Century."

When everything is important, nothing has priority. Various think tanks and seminars have tried to outline a focused foreign policy for a post-Cold War America, with limited impact.

"The post-Cold War world still awaits its 'X' article," University of Chicago political scientist Stephen M. Walt said, referring to the 1947 article by George Kennan that outlined the U.S. policy of containment of the Soviet Union.

A blue-ribbon commission gathered by Harvard University turned out a report called "America's National Interests" that noted a "drift" in foreign policy because the former single-minded goal of defeating communism has been replaced by a wish list of desirable goals.

The commission singled out five "vital" long-range goals: to deter any attack on the U.S., to keep a "hostile hegemon" from rising in Europe or Asia, to keep a hostile power from controlling the seas, to ensure the survival of America's allies and to keep major global systems -- of trade, finance, energy and the environment -- from breaking down.

In the shorter range, it said, the next U.S. president will have to cope with China's growing power, keep Russia from reverting to civil war or authoritarianism, keep nuclear

and biological weapons under control, polish alliances with Europe and Japan and "maintain singular U.S. leadership, military capabilities and international credibility."

Even this ambitious program tends to get swamped by day-to-day problems, which may be one reason why America's power does not always produce the result desired in Washington.

For all its reach, the United States can only influence many decisions, not command them. It cannot make the Russian Duma (lower house of Parliament) ratify the START-II treaty or force China to end abuse of workers or, in the most recent case, whistle up instant support for its plan to punish Saddam Hussein.

For all its power, America also is dominated by global forces beyond its control. The \$1 trillion U.S. national debt means that Washington still must march to the tune of global bond markets, which tell the administration how much it can spend.

Much of America's post-Cold War dominance comes through "soft power," as Harvard professor Joseph Nye has dubbed it. This is the power not of nuclear weapons but of television programs, universities, stock markets, styles and commercial products. Mostly, it's the openness and opportunities of a society that draws millions of immigrants who wouldn't dream of emigrating to, say, China or Russia.

To some, this is a kind of non-threatening power that makes America a "benign hegemon," as the Singapore diplomat said, and deflects the fear and opposition that would lead other nations to gang up against it.

"America is different," Joffe said. "It irks and domineers, but it does not conquer. It tries to call the shots and bend the rules, but it does not go to war for land and glory ..."

"For the balance-of-power machinery to crank up, it makes a difference whether the rest of the world faces a huge but usually placid elephant or a carnivorous *Tyrannosaurus rex*."

A placid elephant can't command the awe and deference that many Americans feel

their nation's sweeping power deserves. This may be the reason for a national sourness among Americans who feel unappreciated by the rest of the world.

This is reflected in a general suspicion of the global economy, in an irritation over the world's failure to rally to the American policy toward Iraq, in the refusal to pay America's debt to the UN or increase its support of the IMF.

Public opinion polls routinely show that Americans support a strong U.S. role in

the world. With the Cold War over, this support, while still vigorous, has taken a back seat to public demands for domestic action. According to a recent University of Maryland poll, Congress has misinterpreted this passive support for foreign affairs as an active dislike of the rest of the world and has responded by cutting spending on foreign programs, including the UN.

This reaction leads to regular spasms of fear in the world that the U.S. may be going isolationist, at the moment when its power is at its peak.

For all the resentment of American triumphalism, the prospect of American withdrawal is more frightening than American dominance.

"The only alternative to American power is global anarchy," Brzezinski said.

Or, as Dominique Moisi, deputy director of the French Institute for International Relations, said, "Europeans don't know what to fear most -- to be abandoned by the United States or to be dominated by it."

Next: Who really runs U.S. foreign policy?

New York Times

April 12, 1998

U.S. Frets Over Closer German-French-Russian Ties

By Steven Erlanger

WASHINGTON -- The problem with labeling yourself the world's "indispensable nation," as Secretary of State Madeleine Albright is fond of calling the United States, is that you become hypersensitive if other nations, less convinced or more uneasy, start meeting without you.

Late last month in Moscow, the French, Germans and Russians had their very first summit meeting, and Washington did not take the prospect calmly. Senior U.S. officials like Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott were feverishly interrogating their French and German counterparts about what such a meeting might encompass and what it might mean.

The United States regards the new Russia as something of a pet project, if not exactly a client. Helping Russia to feel part of a wider Europe, as NATO enlarges, is fine as far as it goes. But the Americans want to be sure that any special Franco-German understandings with Russia won't undercut an already fraying U.S.-Russia relationship.

A Matter of Resentment

Just as important, the simple fact of undisputed U.S. power tends to create resentment and efforts at counterbalance, especially among newly reduced nations like Russia or rising ones like China.

Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Chinese President Jiang Zemin have already held summit meetings in which they took turns denouncing the dangers of a "mono-polar world." It is a theme that has always made hearts beat a little faster in Gaullist France, which still sees the European Union, in essence, as a counterweight to a clumsy Washington.

As it happened, the troika summit itself had little substance, and it was much overshadowed by Yeltsin's impulsive decision, a couple of days before, to fire his prime minister and the entire Cabinet. Having just returned to work after another illness, Yeltsin behaved bizarrely, calling for a post-summit press conference before the summit meeting itself began.

But with another such summit scheduled next year in France -- and with Britain, currently holding the European Union presidency, left out entirely -- there were a lot of quizzical eyebrows raised.

German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, a fond friend of the United States, may lose his job this autumn to a Social Democrat, Gerhard Schroeder, and no one can predict with any certainty who or what might follow a clearly deteriorating Yeltsin.

On Iran and Iraq, and now on Kosovo, the French position is increasingly closer to the Russian view than the U.S. one. Traditional French power politics nearly requires, with Rus-

sia so much weaker than Washington, that Paris lean more firmly toward Moscow, and if Bonn can be pulled along, so much the better.

French President Jacques Chirac took pride in what he called an "extremely symbolic" event. "Historically," he said, "relations among Russia, Germany and France have always been complex, full of ulterior motives and contradictory strategies. This is the first time, in our contemporary history, that Germany, France and Russia are meeting together in Moscow."

Kohl looked uneasy during Yeltsin's antics, especially during the dazed Russian leader's disquisition on the summit as a milestone in the creation of a "Greater Europe," which, he predicted, "will be the dominant power."

Kohl went out of his way to stress that this "big troika" was not aimed at the United States -- much the same message that the Americans so often try to send the Russians about NATO expansion. "This meeting is, naturally, not directed at anyone else," he said, and he made sure the agenda stuck to continental, rather than transatlantic, issues.

Keeping Washington Informed

Even more striking, senior German diplomats immediately telephoned senior U.S. officials at the State Department, as soon as the meeting was over, to give a readout of what had happened there, without waiting for the Americans to ask. And both French and German officials briefed the British.

David Calleo, director of

European Studies at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies here, sees a basic irony in the American angst. "We push the Russians around on NATO enlargement and the Caspian Sea, and we push the Europeans to get their act together and do their own thing, and then we act surprised," he said.

It's hard to complain about the Russians, who have been feeling neglected, wanting to have a relationship with two major European powers, Calleo said. "It would be even worse to have the French and Russians together without the Germans. Europe depends to a

great degree on the Franco-German connection, and if anything goes seriously wrong with that, we're in trouble."

It was essentially for that reason, German diplomats explain, that Kohl reluctantly accepted the Franco-Russian invitation to the summit in the first place, even though it left the British out.

Since World War II, Germany has always looked to Washington for both connections and protection, wanting to insure that the United States remains tightly bound to Europe and European security. The U.S. presence keeps not only French ambitions in

check, but German ones, too -- something of a relief to those Germans who are suspicious of their own impulses.

Like most peoples, the Germans don't mind being wooed, but don't want to feel ripped between the Anglo-Saxons on one hand and a traditional French-Russian alliance on the other. German officials chose to see the summit in the context of European stability.

"There is a strong desire on the part of Russia not to sit down at European tables all the time with Holland and Luxembourg and Belgium," a senior German official said. "It's an

identity issue for Moscow. They prefer to discuss these issues of European security with nations they consider adequate."

And a French official urged Washington to calm itself. "The main purpose is to try to show Moscow that EU and NATO enlargement is not aimed at Russia," the official said. "Regional initiatives will happen in a globalized world. We don't, as in the past, systematically interpret what the Americans do in foreign policy as directed against us, and we hope the Americans won't assume that all we do is directed at them."

Washington Post

April 11, 1998

Pg. 9

Missile Parts Sent To Iraq Detailed Russian Group Offers Findings

By David Hoffman
Washington Post
Foreign Service

MOSCOW—More than 800 sophisticated gyroscopes for intercontinental ballistic missiles were shipped from Moscow for Iraq in 1995, a number far larger than previously reported, according to the findings of an independent nonproliferation research group here.

The gyroscopes were intercepted by Jordanian authorities in November 1995, before they could be delivered to Iraq. Previous reports have suggested there were about 115 gyroscopes in the shipment bound for Iraq in violation of United Nations sanctions.

But an investigation by the Center for Policy Studies in Russia has found there were 800 of the sensitive devices, which keep missiles on target, and another 10 "samples" delivered earlier. They had been removed from the command modules of Russian SS-N-18 submarine-launched ballistic missiles being destroyed under arms control treaties.

Russian government officials have repeatedly denied that they are allowing technology for weapons of mass destruction to reach Iraq and Iran. But there have been persistent reports that Russia's vast military industrial complex, facing hard times, has been fertile ground for countries shopping

for ballistic missile technology. The latest findings of the research group suggest that it was possible for a large quantity of electronic gear for missiles to be bought, sold and shipped from Russia in late 1995.

The research group reported that Iraq had contracted to buy the devices through a company that had been set up by senior Russian managers at the factory where the missiles were being destroyed. The investigation also found that Iraqi President Saddam Hussein's son-in-law, Hussein Kamel Hassan Majeed, who later defected to Jordan and returned to Iraq only to be brutally executed, had sought the missile guidance systems.

The research group made available to The Washington Post a 14-page summary of its findings about the gyroscope export. Last year, the research group issued a similar report on a smaller batch of missile gyroscopes that also came from Russia and were pulled from the Tigris River in Baghdad by U.N. arms inspectors on Dec. 9, 1995.

The guidance systems were shipped in violation of U.N. sanctions, which bar Iraq from obtaining technology for missiles with a range greater than 93 miles. The gyroscopes came from Russian strategic missiles with a range of more than 4,000 miles.

Russia at first denied that the gyroscopes were from its

missiles. But after Rolf Ekeus, who then headed the U.N. Special Commission in charge of probing Iraq's weapons programs, came to Moscow with detailed evidence in February 1996, officials acknowledged that the guidance systems had come from Russia but denied that the government had given approval. A Russian criminal investigation was opened, then closed without any charges being brought.

The research group's latest report said that all the gyroscopes came from the same missile destruction factory, the Scientific Testing Institute of Chemical Machine Building, in Sergiyev Posad, a town north of Moscow. Vladimir Orlov, director of the group, said the case underscores that "Russia's legal system didn't work well" because those responsible for exporting the gyroscopes were not charged. Former prime minister Viktor Chernomyrdin recently signed decrees ordering stricter export controls, but Orlov said Russian criminal laws and enforcement mechanisms remain weak.

Western politicians and intelligence experts have expressed skepticism that such leaks of know-how and equipment could occur without the knowledge of high-ranking Russian government officials. The factory where the missiles were dismantled is state-owned, as is most of the military-industrial complex. But Orlov disagreed, and said his group's research suggests "this was just a commercial deal."

Orlov's report last year on the gyroscopes suggested the devices seized in Jordan had come not from Russia, but from Europe. Orlov said he now believes all the gyroscopes came from Russia. His group's latest report provides a more detailed account of the path of the 810 gyroscopes. Orlov said the group received additional information, which led to the new report. The case has also been investigated by the U.N. Special Commission.

A key player in the case is a Palestinian, Weaam Gharbiyeh, who had lived in the United States, Canada and later in Jordan. Orlov's report says that Gharbiyeh had been a computer expert who made contact with Iraq's special services and Hussein Kamel, Saddam's son-in-law, who was Iraq's defense minister.

Gharbiyeh came to Russia in late 1993 and dabbled in the computer business, the report says. Early the next year, he contacted the managers of the missile destruction plant, including the deputy director of economic affairs, the chief accountant, the first deputy director and the deputy general director. None is identified by name in the report.

They began detailed negotiations on selling equipment to Gharbiyeh, the report says. Two of the Russian managers were directly involved in the deal, according to the document, which was signed in July 1995. The deal was made with a company, SPM-Systema, which actually represented the

factory managers.

Gharbiyeh asked for samples and received 10 of the gyroscopes. He took them to Iraq via Jordan, the document says, and once in Iraq showed them to Hussein Kamel. After this, Gharbiyeh returned to Moscow, and lines of credit were opened in a bank here to be distributed to the factory for \$100,000 and \$20,000, the report says, although the money was never paid.

According to the report, the gyroscopes recovered from the Tigris by the U.N. inspectors were the 10 "samples" brought to Baghdad. Some had been damaged.

In August 1995, a deal was struck for 800 more gyroscopes. According to the report, they were sold by the factory to the company created by the factory managers. Since it was a Russian company, the report says, the sale did not

break the law. Then the gyroscopes, labeled "micromotors," made their way to the Moscow airport.

Gharbiyeh used a Russian company owned by Nigerians to expedite the shipment. The report quotes Jordanian sources as saying that Gharbiyeh was extremely careful in his preparations. The report also quotes Gharbiyeh as saying he had a chance to obtain "a whole guidance system" but decided

that would breach the law.

When the gyroscopes were shipped to Jordan, they were put in a customs warehouse, but by that time, Hussein Kamel had left Iraq.

The report says, "As Gharbiyeh found out, nobody else expected him and his goods in Baghdad." He later went on to Baghdad without the gyroscopes, which were intercepted by Jordanian authorities, the report says.

New York Times

April 12, 1998

Saudis Make Nice With Iranians

By Elaine Sciolino

WASHINGTON -- For half a century, the Persian Gulf has held a crucial place in U.S. policy-making. Repeatedly, its oil and its leaders have drawn the United States into its sometimes deadly games, even as its rivalries and intrigues have confounded U.S. strategy.

So the United States can end up preoccupied with the smallest events, on the assumption that they may be the prelude to something big.

This is one of those times. Saudi Arabia, America's closest ally in the Persian Gulf, and Iran, one of Washington's most bitter foes, have been busy trying to charm each other. Nobody in Washington thinks the basic relationships among the three countries have shifted.

But U.S. officials are taking notice, aware that even subtle atmospheric changes can have far-reaching psychological effects in the Middle East.

In the two decades since Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini fomented Iran's revolution, the Saudis and Iranians have never been particularly close. Khomeini asserted that all the gulf Arab monarchies -- including Saudi Arabia -- were illegitimate. Even in death, he spewed venom against the Saudis. His last will and testament called for the public cursing of the Saudi royal family for "treachery" against the House of God.

Since then, Saudi Arabia and Iran have moved slowly -- very slowly -- to shape a more normal relationship. That effort accelerated late last year, when Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah met Iranian President Moham-

med Khatami in Tehran at the summit of Islamic countries. After two meetings, the Iranian cleric and the Saudi prince gave signals that they had, in a manner of speaking, bonded.

This "is the start of a new era in relations between the two big countries of the region," Khatami told Abdullah. "I truly feel that I am in my own country," the crown prince replied.

The feel-good encounters were followed by a pilgrimage by former Iranian President Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani to Mecca in March. The pilgrimage was a kind of dry run for Khatami, who has now been invited to visit Saudi Arabia.

These days, there are no more rumblings from the kingdom that Iran might have been involved in the terrorist bombing of an apartment building in Saudi Arabia in 1996 that left 19 U.S. servicemen dead. In fact, Saudi Arabia announced last month that it would allow its national airline to fly in and out of Tehran for the first time since shortly after the revolution.

So the question in Washington is: What's up?

It's not that the Saudis no longer feel a threat from Iran. They do. They have no illusion that Iran has abandoned its long-term goal of dominance in the gulf. And in the strict religious tradition of the Wahabi branch of Islam that dominates Saudi Arabia, Iran's Shiites come close to being apostates.

But the Saudis also want to get along. It takes only 15 minutes for a fighter jet from Iran's southern port of Bushehr to reach Saudi Arabia's northern oil fields. Saudi Arabia has serious problems with its own

restless Shiites. The two countries are OPEC's largest oil producers, and a coordinated oil policy is in the interests of both. And gestures of reconciliation further isolate their mutual enemy of the moment, Iraq.

So Abdullah has little reason to ignore an Iranian leader who preaches a desire to reach out and touch his neighbors.

"Does all this mean that the Saudis trust the Iranians or that the Iranians trust the Saudis?" asked Anthony Cordesman, the military analyst and author. "Hell, no. The basic power structure of the gulf is a constant balancing and rebalancing act. They are trying to exploit opportunities and jockey for power. It's basic balance-of-power politics."

And that is where the U.S. anxiety comes in, because the United States is a crucial player in the balancing act. Saudi Arabia's close relationship with America and the large U.S. military presence in the gulf have created friction between the Saudis and the Iranians. Pentagon planners wonder whether the two countries could eventually reach an understanding on dictating limits on the U.S. military presence.

The stability of the Saudi kingdom is of so much concern to the United States that since the bombing of the military housing, a special task force of analysts has been studying the kingdom under the same rigorous process used to assess the most serious potential threats to U.S. national security.

The Saudis who hold power now are not about to walk away from the United States, of course. It's just that the relationship is a lot more difficult than when King Fahd was in good health, in charge and ea-

ger to please the United States. Crown Prince Abdullah, who is running the country on a day-to-day basis, simply isn't as likely as his brother the king to say yes every time the United States asks for something.

When Defense Secretary William Cohen visited in February in a vain effort to win support for possible military action against Iraq, Crown Prince Abdullah simply made himself unavailable. Prince Sultan, the defense minister, stood in.

A week later, the crown prince did turn up for a meeting with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. Ever-protective of his boss, State Department spokesman James Rubin said she found the encounter "fascinating"; other officials described it as a stern lecture by Abdullah on the failings of U.S. policy in the Middle East, followed by an equally stern defense by Ms. Albright.

The Iranians, meanwhile, are not about to embrace the United States. They have been demanding for two decades that the U.S. military leave the gulf, and that is not likely to change. But already the Saudis have urged the Clinton administration to help along Iran's new president and have offered to mediate.

One thought remains profoundly comforting to the policy planners in Washington. Whatever else is going on between Saudi Arabia and Iran, trust is not part of the equation.

Crown Prince Hamad bin Isa al-Khalifa of Bahrain, one of Saudi Arabia's close neighbors, shared a joke recently with a senior U.S. official visiting the sheikdom. In Iran, he said, "You have three people in charge: You have Khamenei,

and he is in charge of religion and terrorism," referring to Iran's ruling spiritual leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei. "You have Rafsanjani, and he is in charge of business and terrorism. And you have Khatami, and he is in charge of internal politics, moderation and terrorism."

U.S. Denies Limitations On Antisatellite Weapons

The United States is not engaged in discussions with Russia on limiting antisatellite capabilities, a senior White House official said April 9.

Robert Bell, senior director for de-

fense policy at the president's National Security Council, said reports that the United States and Russia were discussing new limits on antisatellite weapons are false. "Our approach does not constrain the United States' right to counter space systems that are being used for purposes hostile to U.S. national security interests," Bell said.

New York Times

April 11, 1998

Pg. 3

U.S. Says N. Korea Helped Develop New Pakistani Missile

By Tim Weiner

WASHINGTON, April 10 - Pakistan's test of a new missile with a range exceeding 900 miles, a weapon able to strike Bombay or New Delhi with a nuclear warhead, was based on technology smuggled from North Korea, United States Government officials and private analysts said today.

The new liquid-fueled missile, called the Ghauri, is an enhanced version of the North Korean Rodong missile, which is itself a fancy version of the Scud missile developed in Moscow in the 1960's, they said.

"The Pakistani missile is based on North Korean technology," said Gary Milhollin, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control and an analyst of the spread of weapons. "It was a cloak-and-dagger operation by Pakistan, which concealed the transaction." Government officials confirmed that account.

The United States knew before the test, on Monday, that North Korea had smuggled the missile technology into Pakistan, the officials said. Washington tried to persuade the Pakistanis not to test the missile, saying it would increase tensions and step up the arms race between Pakistan and its regional rival, India. India has tested a medium-range missile, called the Prithvi, capable of striking anywhere in Pakistan.

Official comment on the Ghauri missile test came today from Malik Zahoor Ahmed, a spokesman at the Pakistani Embassy here, who denied that North Korea had helped his country.

"This is indigenous technol-

ogy," he said, "though technology of course does not have to come from one source."

He added: "The threat we are facing from India is factual.

It is also a historical fact that Ghauri defeated Prithvi." Ghauri, a 12th-century Muslim emperor, attacked India and defeated Prithvi, the Hindu ruler of New Delhi.

In an effort to persuade Pakistan to forgo testing the new missile, the United States offered to help resolve a dispute over \$650 million that Pakistan has paid for 28 F-16 fighter planes it ordered. The planes are parked in Arizona, their delivery stalled by a 1990 Congressional act suspending military aid to Pakistan. The act

was passed after President George Bush said he was not able to certify that Pakistan was not developing nuclear weapons.

Pakistan wants the planes or its money back. "We said there was an understanding that the Pakistanis would maintain the status quo on missile tests in return for our help on the F-16 question, either getting the planes delivered or getting their money back," Mr. Milhollin said. "But they went ahead and tested it anyway."

India and Pakistan have gone to war three times since 1947. Both are capable of producing nuclear weapons, and their development of more sophisticated longer-range missiles is both a heated war of

words and a regional arms race that the United States finds increasingly worrisome.

Neither nation has signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty or the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. India's new coalition Government, led by Hindu nationalists, has announced that it is reviewing whether to introduce nuclear weapons into its arsenal.

North Korea has also supplied its liquid-fueled missile technology to Iran, Syria and Egypt, Mr. Milhollin said.

Such sales represent one of the few lucrative exports from North Korea, one of the world's last Communist nations, whose economy is in very poor shape and whose people are widely thought to be near starvation.

Miami Herald

April 11, 1998

Iran reportedly bought \$25 million N-weapons

JERUSALEM -- (AP) -- Iran paid \$25 million for two tactical nuclear weapons smuggled out of the former Soviet Union in the early 1990s, an Israeli newspaper reported Friday, citing Iranian documents.

Technicians from Argentina were involved in the secret operation, The Jerusalem Post reported. It said the documents have been in U.S. government hands for several years and are being studied by Israel.

Friday's story in the Post was the second on the subject in two days. On Thursday, after the first article appeared, the Pentagon said it had "no evidence whatsoever" that Iran acquired several nuclear warheads from the former Soviet Union at that time.

Friday, the Israeli newspaper quoted from what it said was an Iranian document dated Dec. 26, 1991. In it, Brig. Gen.

Rahim Safavi, deputy commander of the Revolutionary Guards Council, discussed a meeting with Riza Amrullahi, the head of Iran's Atomic Energy Commission.

Citing Amrullahi, the general wrote that "the efforts of the Islamic Republic's intelligence forces . . . have borne fruit and two tactical atomic weapons from Russia have been delivered to Iranian sources in the Astara region."

"The source added that they paid \$25 million for these weapons of a tactical nature," Safavi wrote, according to the

newspaper.

In later documents, according to the Post, Iranian officials complained that the Argentine technicians involved in the project were "lazy, greedy and egotistical" and said they hoped Russian technicians who had arrived in Iran would not cause such problems.

Israel had no comment on the report.

Israel has previously complained to the United States that Russia is helping Iran acquire non-conventional weapons, a charge Russia denies.

Wall Street Journal

April 13, 1998

Pg. 1

Mexico sought to expel 12 foreigners for unauthorized political activity in support of Zapatista rebels in Chiapas state, site of a simmering Indian insurgency that broke out in 1994. Two news cameramen said soldiers beat them and attempted to take their film.

Lockheed, Northrop Attack Antitrust Suit

Washington Post April 11, 1998 Pg. D1

By Tim Smart
Washington Post
Staff Writer

Lockheed Martin Corp. and Northrop Grumman Corp. said yesterday that the Justice Department is using misguided analysis of antitrust law in trying to block their proposed \$12 billion merger and argued that the deal would actually increase competition rather than hinder it.

In the companies' 80-page response to a March 23 government lawsuit, the aerospace giants say that rather than limiting competition, as the government alleges, the deal would enable the two firms to compete more effectively against rivals Boeing Co. and Raytheon Co.

The companies contend that those two competitors -- both of whom completed multibillion-dollar mergers of their own within the past two years with minimal government objection -- are far larger in aircraft manufacturing and defense electronics, respectively.

After its recent mergers with McDonnell Douglas Corp. and the defense business of Rockwell International Corp., "Boeing is presently seven times larger than Lockheed Martin in aircraft, and twice as large in military aircraft," according to the filing.

"Through its acquisitions of

Hughes and the defense business of Texas Instruments (both of which the government approved), Raytheon has emerged as twice as large in defense electronics," the companies contend.

In its suit, the Justice Department argues that Bethesda-based Lockheed Martin's proposed purchase of Northrop Grumman would impede competition, lessen innovation and result in higher prices for weapons purchased by the Pentagon. The department attacked the deal, the largest merger the government has ever challenged, on the grounds that it restricts competition through too great a vertical integration of the weapons-manufacturing process.

The companies offered to spin off about \$1 billion in assets, primarily businesses that make defense electronics, to satisfy the government. But the Justice Department rejected that idea and prior to the lawsuit insisted on divestitures of closer to \$4 billion in assets.

The opposition of both the Justice and Defense departments to the deal shocked the companies, which had assumed the transaction would go through smoothly, as have many prior deals since 1993, when the Pentagon began encouraging the industry to consolidate.

Many in the defense indus-

try and on Wall Street questioned the abrupt change of mind, saying it represented a switch in policy. But Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and other department leaders have denied that, saying the agreement to combine Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman raised new concerns about industry concentration.

If Lockheed Martin acquired Northrop Grumman, for example, it would be the manufacturer of both the F-22 jet fighter and the state-of-the-art radar that goes into it.

The government also believes that Northrop Grumman is a viable competitor, with \$9 billion in annual sales, and has proven to be an innovator in such fields as the development of stealth technology.

But Lockheed Martin, in its filing yesterday, took issue with the government's characterization of the defense marketplace, saying Justice Department lawyers alternatively shrank and enlarged the markets for these products to support their position.

The department "has gerrymandered its market definitions to create competition between Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman where none exists, and to exclude their competitors where the merging parties do compete," the brief said.

The companies also contend that taxpayers will reap substantial cost savings from the

merger. In the past, the companies have said the government could expect savings of \$1 billion from the deal, with about half of that related to Pentagon contracts.

The response raised questions about the wisdom of the companies waging legal war with their biggest customer.

"I personally question the validity of biting the hand that feeds you," said JSA Research analyst Paul Nisbet, pointing out that Lockheed Martin gets two-thirds of its \$27 billion in annual sales from government contracts.

Since the announcement in early March that the deal was likely to be blocked by the government, Northrop Grumman's stock has fallen by more than \$20 a share from its high earlier this year. Lockheed Martin's shares have risen and fallen in a narrow range. The stock markets were closed yesterday, when the brief was filed.

Nisbet said the damage already done to Northrop Grumman's stock reflects the view that the company will emerge weaker than Lockheed Martin if the deal is not completed.

"I don't think it hurts Lockheed Martin that much," Nisbet said. "In the case of Northrop, the premium for the acquisition has been washed out of the stock. The market is giving it no chance of going through."

European Stars & Stripes

April 12, 1998

Pg. 6

Tiny holes in B-2 wing mean huge repair bill

WASHINGTON (AP) — Small holes have been discovered in one of the Air Force's eight B-2 stealth bombers, damage that could cost up to \$500,000 to repair, the service announced Friday.

The cause of the damage was unknown, but it might have been caused by a lightning strike, said Air Force spokesman Lt. Col. Jay DeFrank.

All the service's B-2s are based with the 509th Bomb Wing at Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo. Each aircraft cost \$2 billion.

The damaged aircraft bears the name Spirit of Missouri.

Damage amounts to small holes in the stealth material on one of the wings, the spokesman said. The plane is covered with specialized materials that enable it to absorb

The bat-winged airplane is able to fly despite the damage, he said.

A pair of B-2s recently flew to Guam in the first overseas deployment of the bomber, but the damaged aircraft was not one of them.

DeFrank said the damage "may have been caused by a static discharge. ... We think it could be related to lightning."

"This is a preliminary report. They are investigating what really did it," spokesman Elliott said.

No B-2 has yet flown a combat mission. Eight are operational, and the Air Force plans to build 21 in all.

The first B-2 entered service at Whiteman in December 1993.

or deflect radar signals and thus avoid detection.

The damage occurred to the front edge of one of the wings, said Lt. Eric Elliott, a spokesman for the Air Combat Command at Langley, Va., which has responsibility for the planes.

Elliott said the damage, which initially had been thought to carry up to a \$2 million price tag to repair, had been found to be less extensive than first thought, and therefore not as expensive to repair.

Elliott said the plane was struck by lightning Feb. 26, but that no damage had been detected until the past several days. "They think that's when it could have occurred," the spokesman said.

High court not enough for highest honor

Bill would make most justices ineligible for burial at Arlington

By Tony Mauro
USA TODAY

ARLINGTON, Va. — Just down the hill from the noisy crowds at John F. Kennedy's grave is the final, quieter resting place of Supreme Court justice Thurgood Marshall.

"Civil rights advocate" reads the inscription on the gravestone of Marshall, the nation's first black Supreme Court justice, who died in 1993 at age 84.

Six of the eight retired Supreme Court justices who have died in the past two decades have come to rest at Arlington National Cemetery. Ten justices in all are buried here, compared with only two presidents: Kennedy and William Howard Taft, who also was a Supreme Court justice.

But under a bill passed by the House and pending in the Senate, justices, members of Congress and ambassadors would be barred from Arlington unless they are highly decorated veterans.

The bill, which would make no exceptions, comes in the wake of last year's controversy over ambassador and Democratic fund-raiser M. Larry Lawrence. Lawrence was buried at Arlington in 1996 with the help of a waiver granted by Army Secretary Togo West because of his diplomatic service.

Republicans charged that the waiver was granted because of his Democratic party ties, and then it was revealed that Lawrence also had falsified his record of service in the Merchant Marines.

Lawrence's body has since been removed by his family and reburied in San Diego.

More than 250,000 people are buried in the 612 acres across the Potomac River from Washington. Only long-serving or highly decorated veterans, former prisoners of war, certain government officials and some dependents are eligible for burial unless granted a waiver. Nearly 200 people have been buried with waivers, a practice that would be eliminated in the bill under debate.

It would exclude all the current justices, even those with military records. Only Chief Justice William Rehnquist

could be buried here, and only because his wife, Natalie, died in 1991 and is already buried in a site reserved for Rehnquist under rules still in effect.

Justice John Paul Stevens, awarded a Bronze Star for his World War II naval intelligence work, would not qualify for burial here. Only winners of the Silver Star and similarly high honors would.

Among justices buried at Arlington, Marshall and Warren Burger would have been ineligible for burial if the proposed law had been in effect when they died. They had no military service.

The Supreme Court has not commented on the pending legislation. But David Pride, director of the Supreme Court Historical Society, says justices deserve to be honored at Arlington.

"This is national service beyond the call of duty," Pride says. "If the nation has not made any other provision for them, they should be buried at Arlington if they want to be."

Adds George Christensen, an ama-

teur historian who has cataloged the resting places of all the justices: "More darned rules and regulations? Who needs it?"

Justice Hugo Black, the legendary First Amendment absolutist, is buried here under a stone that notes he was an Army captain but ignores his Supreme Court service.

The front of the stone of William O. Douglas, the longest-serving justice in American history, notes that he was an Army private; only on the back does it say he was a justice from 1939 to 1975.

Justices William Brennan Jr., Arthur Goldberg, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Potter Stewart and Earl Warren also are buried here.

The bill before Congress also recognizes that the cemetery will run out of space in 2025 if burials continue at their current pace. About 2,400 people are buried here every year. The cemetery has 63,500 unused burial sites.

Newsweek

April 20, 1998

Pg. 4

BRITAIN

More Military

DETERMINED THAT BRITAIN remain America's chief ally, Tony Blair's Labour government is planning the country's most comprehensive military overhaul in 30 years. The goal: to switch from a cold-war central-Europe focus to

global quick-response forces.

The centerpiece of the proposal: three new full-size carriers, probably deploying the U.S.-made Joint Strike Fighter. Other changes include cutting British troops in Germany, shrinking the Air Force and transforming the legendary paratroopers into a helicopter-

borne air-mobile brigade. Blair hasn't yet approved the plan. But it reflects his view that unless Europe can provide America with military help around the world, congressional support for a continued U.S. presence in Europe will dwindle.

Richmond Times-Dispatch

April 13, 1998

Pg. 4

Taliban forces launch major spring offensive

QULAI MURAT BEG, Afghanistan —

In their first major offensive in months, Taliban forces backed by artillery fire and fighter jets overran four enemy enclaves north of the Afghan capital, senior Taliban

officials said yesterday.

Taliban forces launched the attack late Saturday, pounding opposition positions at Guldara, commander Mullah Hezattullah said.

Artillery and rocket fire continued yesterday, as a stream of Taliban reinforcements headed north to the front lines from Kabul.

Iran's president met with hard-line rivals to try to defuse a confrontation over the jailing of Tehran's moderate mayor, a Khatami ally, on corruption charges. The government appealed to students to call off protests this week to demand his release.

Wall Street Journal

April 13, 1998 Pg. 1

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski

NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus

EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee

EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson

SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe **ADMINISTRATION:** Wendy Powers **PRODUCTION:** Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)